

**Multi-input control-affine systems static feedback equivalent to a triangular form and their flatness**Shunjie Li<sup>a,c</sup> Florentina Nicolau<sup>b</sup> and Witold Respondek<sup>b,c,\*</sup><sup>a</sup>*School of mathematics and statistics, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, 210044, Nanjing, China*<sup>b</sup>*Normandie Université, INSA de Rouen, Laboratoire de Mathématiques, 76801, Saint-Etienne-du-Rouvray, France*<sup>c</sup>*Institute of Cyber-Systems and Control, Zhejiang University, 310027, Hangzhou, China*

(v4.0 released February 2014)

In this paper, we give a complete geometric characterization of systems locally static feedback equivalent to a triangular form compatible with the chained form, for  $m = 1$ , respectively with the  $m$ -chained form, for  $m \geq 2$ . They are  $x$ -flat systems. We provide a system of first order PDE's to be solved in order to find all  $x$ -flat outputs, for  $m = 1$ , respectively all minimal  $x$ -flat outputs, for  $m \geq 2$ . We illustrate our results by examples, in particular by an application to a mechanical system: the coin rolling without slipping on a moving table.

**1. Introduction**

The notion of flatness has been introduced in control theory in the 1990's by (Fliess et al., 1992; Fliess et al., 1995), see also (Isidori et al., 1986; Jakubczyk, 1993; Martin, 1992; Pomet, 1995), and has attracted a lot of attention because of its multiple applications in the problem of trajectory tracking, motion planning and constructive controllability (see, e.g. (Fliess et al., 1999; Lévine, 2009; Martin et al., 2003; Pereira da Silva, 2001; Pomet, 1997; Respondek, 2003; Schlacher and Schoeberl, 2007)).

The fundamental property of flat systems is that all their solutions may be parameterized by  $m$  functions and their time-derivatives,  $m$  being the number of controls. More precisely, consider a nonlinear control system

$$\Xi : \dot{x} = F(x, u)$$

where  $x$  is the state defined on an open subset  $X$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $u$  is the control taking values in an open subset  $U$  of  $\mathbb{R}^m$  (more generally, an  $n$ -dimensional manifold  $X$  and an  $m$ -dimensional manifold  $U$ , respectively) and the dynamics  $F$  are smooth (the word smooth will always mean  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ -smooth). The system  $\Xi$  is *flat* if we can find  $m$  functions,  $\varphi_i(x, u, \dots, u^{(r)})$ , for some  $r \geq 0$ , called *flat outputs*, such that

$$x = \gamma(\varphi, \dots, \varphi^{(s)}) \text{ and } u = \delta(\varphi, \dots, \varphi^{(s)}), \quad (1)$$

for a certain integer  $s$  and suitable maps  $\gamma$  and  $\delta$ , where  $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m)$ . Therefore all state and control variables can be determined from the flat outputs without integration and all trajectories

---

\*Corresponding author. Email: witold.respondek@insa-rouen.fr

of the system can be completely parameterized. In the particular case  $\varphi_i = \varphi_i(x)$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , we will say that the system is  $x$ -flat. The minimal number of derivatives of components of a flat output  $\varphi$ , needed to express  $x$  and  $u$ , will be called the differential weight of  $\varphi$  (see Section 2 for precise definitions).

The problem of flatness of driftless two-input control-linear systems of the form

$$\Sigma_{lin} : \dot{x} = u_0 g_0(x) + u_1 g_1(x),$$

defined on a open subset  $X$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , has been solved by (Martin and Rouchon, 1994) (see also (Li and Respondek, 2012; Martin and Rouchon, 1993) and a related result of (Cartan, 1914)). According to their result, on an open and dense subset  $X'$  of  $X$ , the system  $\Sigma_{lin}$  is flat if and only if, its associated distribution  $\mathcal{G} = \text{span}\{g_0, g_1\}$  can be locally brought into the Goursat normal form, or equivalently, the control system  $\Sigma_{lin}$  is locally static feedback equivalent to the chained form:

$$Ch_1^k : \begin{cases} \dot{z}_0 = v_0 & \dot{z}_1 = z_2 v_0 \\ & \dot{z}_2 = z_3 v_0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \dot{z}_{k-1} = z_k v_0 \\ & \dot{z}_k = v_1 \end{cases}$$

where  $n = k + 1$ .

The first who noticed the existence of singular points in the problem of transforming a distribution of rank two into the Goursat normal form were (Giaco et al., 1978). (Murray, 1994) presented a regularity condition that guarantees the feedback equivalence of  $\Sigma_{lin}$  to the chained form  $Ch_1^k$  around an arbitrary point  $x^*$ . (Li and Respondek, 2012) studied and solved the following problem: can a driftless two-input system be locally flat at a singular point of  $\mathcal{G}$ ? In other words, can  $\Sigma_{lin}$  be flat without being locally equivalent to the chained form? Their result shows that a Goursat structure is  $x$ -flat only at regular points of  $\mathcal{G}$ . They also described all  $x$ -flat outputs and showed that they are parametrized by an arbitrary function of three variables canonically defined up to a diffeomorphism.

In this paper we give a generalization of these results. Our goal is to characterize control-affine systems that are static feedback equivalent to the following triangular form

$$TCh_1^k : \begin{cases} \dot{z}_0 = v_0 & \dot{z}_1 = f_1(z_0, z_1, z_2) + z_2 v_0 \\ & \dot{z}_2 = f_2(z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3) + z_3 v_0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \dot{z}_{k-1} = f_{k-1}(z_0, \dots, z_k) + z_k v_0 \\ & \dot{z}_k = v_1 \end{cases}$$

compatible with the chained form. Indeed, notice that in the  $z$ -coordinates the distribution spanned by the controlled vector fields is in the chained form (Goursat normal form) and the drift has a triangular structure.

We will completely characterize control-affine systems that are static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$  and show how their geometry differs and how it reminds that of control-linear systems feedback equivalent to the chained form. Then, we will extend this result to the triangular form compatible with the  $m$ -chained form, i.e., we will characterize control-affine systems with  $m + 1$  inputs, where  $m \geq 2$ , that are static feedback equivalent to a normal form obtained by replacing  $z_j$ , in  $TCh_1^k$ , by the vector  $z^j = (z_1^j, \dots, z_m^j)$ , the smooth functions  $f_j$  by  $f^j = (f_1^j, \dots, f_m^j)$  and the control  $v_1$

by the control vector  $(v_1, \dots, v_m)$ . This form will be denoted by  $TCh_m^k$ . Its associated distribution  $\mathcal{G} = \text{span}\{g_0, \dots, g_m\}$ , where  $g_i$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , are the controlled vector fields, is called a Cartan distribution (or a contact distribution) for curves, see (Bryant et al., 1991; Olver, 1995; Vinogradov et al., 1986). The problem of characterizing control-linear systems that are locally static feedback equivalent to the  $m$ -chained form (or equivalently, that of characterizing Cartan distributions for curves) has been studied and solved ((Respondek and Pasillas-Lépine, 2001), see also (Mormul, 2004; Pasillas-Lépine and Respondek, 2000; Pasillas-Lépine and Respondek, 2001a; Shibuya and Yamaguchi, 2009; Yamaguchi, 1982)). It is immediate that systems locally feedback equivalent to the  $m$ -chained form are flat and in (Respondek, 2003), all their minimal flat outputs (i.e., those whose differential weight is the lowest among all flat outputs of the system) have been described.

It is easy to see that the normal form  $TCh_1^k$  (respectively  $TCh_m^k$ ) is  $x$ -flat at any point of  $X \times \mathbb{R}^2$  (respectively  $X \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ ) satisfying some regularity conditions and we describe all its  $x$ -flat outputs (respectively all its minimal  $x$ -flat outputs). Their description reminds very much that of control-linear systems feedback equivalent to the chained form, for  $m = 1$ , respectively to the  $m$ -chained form, for  $m \geq 2$ , although new phenomena appear related to singularities in the state and control-space.

Since  $TCh_1^k$  and  $TCh_m^k$  are flat, the paper gives sufficient conditions for a system to be  $x$ -flat. We will also show that these conditions are not necessary for  $x$ -flatness of control-affine system whose associated distribution spanned by the controlled vector fields  $\mathcal{G} = \text{span}\{g_0, \dots, g_m\}$  is feedback equivalent to the  $m$ -chained form. Indeed, we show that there are  $x$ -flat control-affine systems for which there exist local coordinates in which the distribution spanned by the controlled vector fields has the  $m$ -chained structure but the drift is not triangular (see Example 5.1).

The triangular form  $TCh_1^k$  was considered in (Li et al., 2013), where its flatness was observed but its description was not addressed. A characterization of  $TCh_1^k$  has been recently proven by (Silveira, 2010) and by (Silveira et al., 2013), where a solution dual to ours (using an approach based on differential forms and codistributions rather than distributions) is given. Our aim is to treat in a homogeneous way the two-input case of  $TCh_1^k$  and the multi-input case of  $TCh_m^k$ , using the formalism of vector fields and distributions, as well as to describe all flat outputs and their singularities (which are more natural to deal with in the language of vector fields).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the definition of flatness and define the notion of differential weight of a flat system. In Section 3, we give our main results: we characterize control-affine systems static feedback equivalent to the triangular form  $TCh_1^k$ , for  $m = 1$ , and to  $TCh_m^k$ , for  $m \geq 2$ . We describe in Section 4 all minimal flat outputs including their singularities and we study also singular control values at which the system ceases to be flat. Moreover, we give also in that section a system of first order PDE's to be solved in order to find all  $x$ -flat outputs, for  $m = 1$ , and all minimal  $x$ -flat outputs, for  $m \geq 2$ . We illustrate our results by two examples in Section 5 and provide proofs in Section 6.

## 2. Flatness

Fix an integer  $l \geq -1$  and denote  $U^l = U \times \mathbb{R}^{ml}$  and  $\bar{u}^l = (u, \dot{u}, \dots, u^{(l)})$ . For  $l = -1$ , the set  $U^{-1}$  is empty and  $\bar{u}^{-1}$  is an empty sequence.

**Definition 1:** The system  $\Xi : \dot{x} = F(x, u)$  is *flat* at  $(x^*, \bar{u}^{*l}) \in X \times U^l$ , for  $l \geq -1$ , if there exists a neighborhood  $\mathcal{O}^l$  of  $(x^*, \bar{u}^{*l})$  and  $m$  smooth functions  $\varphi_i = \varphi_i(x, u, \dot{u}, \dots, u^{(l)})$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , defined in  $\mathcal{O}^l$ , having the following property: there exist an integer  $s$  and smooth functions  $\gamma_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , and  $\delta_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , such that

$$x_i = \gamma_i(\varphi, \dot{\varphi}, \dots, \varphi^{(s)}) \text{ and } u_j = \delta_j(\varphi, \dot{\varphi}, \dots, \varphi^{(s)})$$

along any trajectory  $x(t)$  given by a control  $u(t)$  that satisfy  $(x(t), u(t), \dots, u^{(l)}(t)) \in \mathcal{O}^l$ , where  $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m)$  and is called *flat output*.

When necessary to indicate the number of derivatives of  $u$  on which the flat outputs  $\varphi_i$  depend, we will say that the system  $\Xi$  is  $(x, u, \dots, u^{(r)})$ -flat if  $u^{(r)}$  is the highest derivative on which  $\varphi_i$  depend and in the particular case  $\varphi_i = \varphi_i(x)$ , we will say that the system is  $x$ -flat. In general,  $r$  is smaller than the integer  $l$  needed to define the neighborhood  $\mathcal{O}^l$  which, in turn, is smaller than the number of derivatives of  $\varphi_i$  that are involved. In our study,  $r$  is always equal to -1, i.e., the flat outputs depend on  $x$  only, and  $l$  is 0.

The minimal number of derivatives of components of a flat output  $\varphi$ , needed to express  $x$  and  $u$ , will be called the differential weight of that flat output and will be formalized as follows. By definition, for any flat output  $\varphi$  of  $\Xi$  there exist integers  $s_1, \dots, s_m$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \gamma(\varphi_1, \dot{\varphi}_1, \dots, \varphi_1^{(s_1)}, \dots, \varphi_m, \dot{\varphi}_m, \dots, \varphi_m^{(s_m)}) \\ u &= \delta(\varphi_1, \dot{\varphi}_1, \dots, \varphi_1^{(s_1)}, \dots, \varphi_m, \dot{\varphi}_m, \dots, \varphi_m^{(s_m)}), \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we can choose  $(s_1, \dots, s_m)$  such that (see (Respondek, 2003)) if for any other  $m$ -tuple  $(\tilde{s}_1, \dots, \tilde{s}_m)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \tilde{\gamma}(\varphi_1, \dot{\varphi}_1, \dots, \varphi_1^{(\tilde{s}_1)}, \dots, \varphi_m, \dot{\varphi}_m, \dots, \varphi_m^{(\tilde{s}_m)}) \\ u &= \tilde{\delta}(\varphi_1, \dot{\varphi}_1, \dots, \varphi_1^{(\tilde{s}_1)}, \dots, \varphi_m, \dot{\varphi}_m, \dots, \varphi_m^{(\tilde{s}_m)}), \end{aligned}$$

then  $s_i \leq \tilde{s}_i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .

We will call  $\sum_{i=1}^m (s_i + 1) = m + \sum_{i=1}^m s_i$  the differential weight of  $\varphi$ . A flat output of  $\Xi$  is called *minimal* if its differential weight is the lowest among all flat outputs of  $\Xi$ . We define the *differential weight* of a flat system to be equal to the differential weight of a minimal flat output.

### 3. Main results: characterization of the triangular form

From now on, we will denote the number of controls by  $m + 1$  (and not by  $m$ ) since, as we will see below, for all classes of systems that follow one control plays a particular role.

Consider the control-affine system

$$\Sigma_{aff} : \dot{x} = f(x) + \sum_{i=0}^m u_i g_i(x), \quad (2)$$

defined on an open subset  $X$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $n = km + 1$  (or an  $n$ -dimensional manifold  $X$ ), where  $f$  and  $g_0, \dots, g_m$  are smooth vector fields on  $X$  and the number of controls is  $m + 1 \geq 2$ .

To  $\Sigma_{aff}$  we associate the following distribution  $\mathcal{G} = \text{span}\{g_0, \dots, g_m\}$ . We define inductively the derived flag of  $\mathcal{G}$  by

$$\mathcal{G}^0 = \mathcal{G} \text{ and } \mathcal{G}^{i+1} = \mathcal{G}^i + [\mathcal{G}^i, \mathcal{G}^i], \quad i \geq 0.$$

Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a non involutive distribution of rank  $d$ , defined on  $X$  and define its annihilator  $\mathcal{D}^\perp = \{\omega \in \Lambda^1(X) : \langle \omega, f \rangle = 0, \forall f \in \mathcal{D}\}$ , where  $\Lambda^1(X)$  stands for the collection of smooth differential 1-forms on  $X$ . A vector field  $c \in \mathcal{D}$  is called characteristic for  $\mathcal{D}$  if it satisfies  $[c, \mathcal{D}] \subset \mathcal{D}$ . The characteristic distribution of  $\mathcal{D}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{C}$ , is the distribution spanned by all its characteristic

vector fields, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{C} = \{c \in \mathcal{D} : [c, \mathcal{D}] \subset \mathcal{D}\}$$

and can be computed as follows. Let  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_q$ , where  $q = n - d$ , be differential 1-forms locally spanning the annihilator of  $\mathcal{D}$ , that is  $\mathcal{D}^\perp = \text{span}\{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_q\}$ . For any  $\omega \in \mathcal{D}^\perp$ , we define  $\mathcal{W}(\omega) = \{f \in \mathcal{D} : f \lrcorner \omega \in \mathcal{D}^\perp\}$ , where  $\lrcorner$  is the interior product. The characteristic distribution of  $\mathcal{D}$  is given by

$$\mathcal{C} = \bigcap_{i=1}^q \mathcal{W}(\omega_i).$$

It follows directly from the Jacobi identity that the characteristic distribution is always involutive.

Our main results describing control-affine systems locally static feedback equivalent to the triangular form compatible to the chained form and to the  $m$ -chained form, are given by the two following theorems corresponding to two-input control-affine systems, i.e.,  $m = 1$  (Theorem 1), and to control-affine systems with  $m + 1$  inputs, for  $m \geq 2$  (Theorem 2). Let us first consider the case  $m = 1$ , which has also been solved, using the formalism of differential forms and codistributions, by (Silveira, 2010) and by (Silveira et al., 2013).

**Theorem 1:** *Consider a two-input control-affine system  $\Sigma_{aff}$ , given by (2), for  $m = 1$ , and fix  $x^* \in X$ , an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ . The system  $\Sigma$  is locally, around  $x^*$ , static feedback equivalent to the triangular form  $TCh_1^k$  if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (Ch1)  $\mathcal{G}^{k-1} = TX$ ;
- (Ch2)  $\mathcal{G}^{k-3}$  is of constant rank  $k - 1$  and, moreover, the characteristic distribution  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2}$  of  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  is contained in  $\mathcal{G}^{k-3}$  and has constant corank one in  $\mathcal{G}^{k-3}$ ;
- (Ch3)  $\mathcal{G}^0(x^*)$  is not contained in  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2}(x^*)$ ;
- (Comp)  $[f, \mathcal{C}^i] \subset \mathcal{G}^i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq k - 2$ , where  $\mathcal{C}^i$  is the characteristic distribution of  $\mathcal{G}^i$ .

It was stated and proved in (Respondek and Pasillas-Lépine, 2001) that items (Ch1)-(Ch3) characterize, locally, the chained form (or equivalently the Goursat normal form). Therefore, they are equivalent to the well known conditions describing the chained form (Murray, 1994) (see also (Kumpera and Ruiz, 1982; Martin and Rouchon, 1994; Montgomery and Zhitomirskii, 2001; Mormul, 2000; Pasillas-Lépine and Respondek, 2001b)):

- (Ch1)'  $\text{rk } \mathcal{G}^i = i + 2$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq k - 1$ ,
- (Ch2)'  $\text{rk } \mathcal{G}^i(x^*) = \text{rk } \mathcal{G}_i(x^*) = i + 2$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq k - 1$ , where the distributions  $\mathcal{G}_i$  form the Lie flag of  $\mathcal{G}$  and are defined by  $\mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{G}_{i+1} = \mathcal{G}_i + [\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_i]$ ,  $i \geq 0$ ,

and assure the existence of a change of coordinates  $z = \phi(x)$  and of an invertible static feedback transformation of the form  $u = \beta \tilde{u}$ , bringing the control vector fields  $g_0$  and  $g_1$  into the chained form.

Item (Comp) takes into account the drift and gives the compatibility conditions for  $f$  to have the desired triangular form in the right system of coordinates, i.e., in coordinates  $z$  in which the controlled vector fields are in the chained form.

Since the distribution  $\mathcal{G}$ , associated to  $\Sigma_{aff}$ , satisfies (Ch1)', all characteristic distributions  $\mathcal{C}^i$  of  $\mathcal{G}^i$  are well defined, for  $1 \leq i \leq k - 2$ . Indeed, recall the following result due to (Cartan, 1914):

**Lemma 1:** (E. Cartan) *Consider a rank two distribution  $\mathcal{G}$  defined on a manifold  $X$  of dimension  $k+1$ , for  $k \geq 3$ . If  $\mathcal{G}$  satisfies  $\text{rk } \mathcal{G}^i = i + 2$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq k - 1$ , everywhere on  $X$ , then each distribution  $\mathcal{G}^i$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq k - 3$ , contains a unique involutive subdistribution  $\mathcal{C}^{i+1}$  that is characteristic for  $\mathcal{G}^{i+1}$  and has constant corank one in  $\mathcal{G}^i$ .*

The conditions of the above theorem are verifiable, i.e., given a two-input control-affine system and an initial point  $x^*$ , we can verify whether it is locally static feedback equivalent, around  $x^*$ , to  $TCh_1^k$  and verification (in terms of vector fields of the initial system) involves derivations and algebraic operations only, without solving PDE's.

Next, we consider the case  $m \geq 2$  and extend the above result to a triangular form compatible with the  $m$ -chained form. An  $(m+1)$ -input driftless control system  $\Sigma_{lin} : \dot{z} = \sum_{i=0}^m v_i g_i(z)$ , defined on  $\mathbb{R}^{km+1}$ , is said to be in the  $m$ -chained form if it is represented by

$$Ch_m^k : \begin{cases} \dot{z}_0 = v_0 & \dot{z}_1^1 = z_1^2 v_0 \cdots \dot{z}_m^1 = z_m^2 v_0 \\ & \dot{z}_1^2 = z_1^3 v_0 \quad \dot{z}_m^2 = z_m^3 v_0 \\ & \vdots \\ \dot{z}_1^{k-1} = z_1^k v_0 \cdots \dot{z}_m^{k-1} = z_m^k v_0 \\ \dot{z}_1^k = v_1 \quad \cdots \quad \dot{z}_m^k = v_m \end{cases}$$

Denote  $\bar{z}^j = (z_1^1, \dots, z_m^1, z_1^2, \dots, z_m^2, \dots, z_1^j, \dots, z_m^j)$ , for  $2 \leq j \leq k$ . Our goal is to characterize the following triangular normal form

$$TCh_m^k : \begin{cases} \dot{z}_0 = v_0 & \dot{z}_1^1 = f_1^1(z_0, \bar{z}^2) + z_1^2 v_0 \cdots \dot{z}_m^1 = f_m^1(z_0, \bar{z}^2) + z_m^2 v_0 \\ & \dot{z}_1^2 = f_1^2(z_0, \bar{z}^3) + z_1^3 v_0 \quad \dot{z}_m^2 = f_m^2(z_0, \bar{z}^3) + z_m^3 v_0 \\ & \vdots \\ \dot{z}_1^{k-1} = f_1^{k-1}(z_0, \bar{z}^k) + z_1^k v_0 \cdots \dot{z}_m^{k-1} = f_m^{k-1}(z_0, \bar{z}^k) + z_m^k v_0 \\ \dot{z}_1^k = v_1 \quad \cdots \quad \dot{z}_m^k = v_m \end{cases}$$

with  $m+1$  inputs,  $m \geq 2$ . Theorem 2 below gives necessary and sufficient conditions for a control system to be locally static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_m^k$ .

**Theorem 2:** Consider a control-affine system  $\Sigma_{aff}$ , given by (2),, on an open subset  $X$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{km+1}$ , for  $m \geq 2$ , and fix  $x^* \in X$ . The system  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is locally, around  $x^*$ , static feedback equivalent to the triangular form  $TCh_m^k$  if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

- ( $m$ -Ch1)  $\mathcal{G}^{k-1} = TX$ ;
- ( $m$ -Ch2)  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  is of constant rank  $(k-2)m+1$  and contains an involutive subdistribution  $\mathcal{L}$  that has constant corank one in  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$ ;
- ( $m$ -Ch3)  $\mathcal{G}^0(x^*)$  is not contained in  $\mathcal{L}(x^*)$ ;
- ( $m$ -Comp)  $[f, \mathcal{C}^i] \subset \mathcal{G}^i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq k-2$ , where  $\mathcal{C}^i$  is the characteristic distribution of  $\mathcal{G}^i$ .

In order to verify the conditions of Theorem 2, we have to check whether the distribution  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  contains an involutive subdistribution  $\mathcal{L}$  of corank one. Checkable necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of such an involutive subdistribution, together with a construction, follow from the work of (Bryant, 1979) and are given explicitly in (Pasillas-Lépine and Respondek, 2001a). We present in Appendix A the conditions for the existence and construction of  $\mathcal{L}$ . In our case, if such a distribution exists, it is always unique. As a consequence, all conditions of Theorem 2 are verifiable, i.e., given a control-affine system and an initial point  $x^*$ , we can verify whether it is locally static feedback equivalent, around  $x^*$ , to  $TCh_m^k$  and verification involves derivations and algebraic operations only, without solving PDE's.

Conditions ( $m$ -Ch1)-( $m$ -Ch3) characterize the  $m$ -chained form (Respondek and Pasillas-Lépine, 2001) (see also (Pasillas-Lépine and Respondek, 2000;

Pasillas-Lépine and Respondek, 2001a)) and assure the existence of a change of coordinates  $z = \phi(x)$  and of an invertible static feedback transformation of the form  $u = \beta\tilde{u}$ , bringing the control vector fields  $g_i$  into the  $m$ -chained form. We define the diffeomorphism  $\phi$  and the feedback transformation  $\beta$  in Appendix B. The diffeomorphism  $\phi$  defines also the coordinates in which the system takes the triangular form  $TCh_m^k$ .

Item *(m-Comp)* takes into account the drift and gives the compatibility conditions for  $f$  to have the desired triangular form in the right system of coordinates, i.e., in  $z$ -coordinates in which the controlled vector fields are in the  $m$ -chained form. Formally it has the same form as *(Comp)* in the case  $m = 1$ .

The characteristic distributions  $\mathcal{C}^i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq k-2$ , are well defined and have corank one in  $\mathcal{G}^{i-1}$ . Indeed, recall the following result stated in (Respondek and Pasillas-Lépine, 2001):

**Lemma 2:** *Assume that a distribution  $\mathcal{G}$  defined on a manifold  $X$  of dimension  $km+1$  satisfies the conditions (m-Ch1)-(m-Ch3) of Theorem 2. Then  $\mathcal{G}^i$  has constant rank  $(i+1)m+1$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq k-2$ , and contains an involutive subdistribution  $\mathcal{L}^i$  of corank one in  $\mathcal{G}^i$ . Moreover  $\mathcal{L}^i$  is the unique corank one subdistribution satisfying this property, for  $0 \leq i \leq k-2$ , and it coincides with the characteristic distribution  $\mathcal{C}^{i+1}$  of  $\mathcal{G}^{i+1}$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq k-3$ .*

It has been shown in (Respondek, 2001) (see also (Respondek and Pasillas-Lépine, 2001)) that all information about the distribution  $\mathcal{G}$  is encoded completely in the existence of the last involutive subdistribution  $\mathcal{L}^{k-2}$  (being, actually, the involutive distribution  $\mathcal{L}$  of item *(m-Ch2)* of Theorem 2) which implies the existence of all involutive subdistributions  $\mathcal{L}^i = \mathcal{C}^{i+1}$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq k-3$ .

The characterization of the chained form (conditions *(Ch1)*-(*Ch3*) of Theorem 1) and that of the  $m$ -chained form (*(m-Ch1)*-(*C-mCh3*) of Theorem 2) are different, but compatibility conditions are the same, compare *(Comp)* and *(m-Comp)*. The involutive subdistribution  $\mathcal{L}$ , which is crucial for the  $m$ -chained form, is absent in the compatibility conditions, but plays a very important role in calculating minimal flat outputs and in describing singularities (see Section 4).

## 4. Flatness and flat outputs description

In this section, firstly, we discuss flatness of control systems static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$ , respectively to  $TCh_m^k$ . Secondly, we answer the question whether a given pair (respectively an  $(m+1)$ -tuple) of smooth functions on  $X$  is an  $x$ -flat output for a system static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$  (respectively a minimal  $x$ -flat output for a system static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_m^k$ ) and, finally, provide a system of PDS's to be solved in order to find all these flat outputs. In particular, we will discuss their uniqueness, their singularities, and compare their description with that of flat outputs for the chained form (respectively for the  $m$ -chained form).

### 4.1 Flatness of control systems static feedback equivalent to $TCh_1^k$

Let us first consider the case  $m = 1$ . It is clear that  $TCh_1^k$  is  $x$ -flat, with  $\varphi = (z_0, z_1)$  being a flat output around any point  $(z^*, v^*)$  satisfying

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial z_{i+1}}(z^*) + v_0^* \neq 0, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k-1,$$

where  $v^* = (v_0^*, v_1^*)$ . Therefore control systems equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$  are  $x$ -flat and exhibit a singularity in the control space (depending on the state) which we will describe in an invariant way as follows. For  $\mathcal{C}^1 \subset \mathcal{C}^2 \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{C}^{k-2}$ , the sequence of characteristic distributions  $\mathcal{C}^i$  of  $\mathcal{G}^i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq k-2$ , see Lemma 1, choose vector fields  $c_1, \dots, c_{k-2}$  such that  $\mathcal{C}^i = \text{span}\{c_1, \dots, c_i\}$ . For

each  $0 \leq i \leq k-3$ , define

$$U_{sing}^i(x) = \left\{ u^i(x) = (u_0^i(x), u_1^i(x))^\top : [f + u_0^i g_0 + u_1^i g_1, \mathcal{C}^{i+1}] \subset \mathcal{G}^i \right\}.$$

The controls  $u^i(x)$  exist, are smooth, and for any  $0 \leq i \leq k-3$  define (for any fixed  $x \in X$ ) a 1-dimensional affine subspace of  $U = \mathbb{R}^2$ . To see those three properties, notice that  $[f, c_{i+1}]$ ,  $[g_0, c_{i+1}]$ , and  $[g_1, c_{i+1}]$  span a distribution of rank one modulo  $\mathcal{G}^i$  (since all three belong to  $\mathcal{G}^{i+1}$  and  $\text{corank}(\mathcal{G}^i \subset \mathcal{G}^{i+1}) = 1$ ) and either  $[g_0, c_{i+1}]$  or  $[g_1, c_{i+1}]$  (or both) does not vanish modulo  $\mathcal{G}^i$ . To calculate  $U_{sing}^i(x)$  explicitly, assume that we have chosen  $(g_0, g_1)$  such that  $g_1 = c_1$ . Then  $[g_1, c_{i+1}] = [c_1, c_{i+1}] \in \mathcal{G}^i$  and  $[f, c_{i+1}] = \alpha[g_0, c_{i+1}] \bmod \mathcal{G}^i$ , for some smooth function  $\alpha$ . We put  $u_0^i(x) = -\alpha(x)$  and  $u_1^i(x)$  arbitrary. It is clear that the definition of  $(u_0^i(x), u_1^i(x))$  does not depend on the choice of  $c_1, \dots, c_{k-2}$  and is feedback invariant (independently of whether we have chosen  $g_1 = c_1$  or not). Indeed, if  $u^i(x) \in U_{sing}^i(x)$ , then for the feedback modified system  $\dot{x} = \tilde{f} + \tilde{g}\tilde{u}$ , where  $\tilde{f} = f + g\alpha$  and  $\tilde{g} = g\beta$ , it is the feedback modified control  $\tilde{u}^i = \beta^{-1}(-\alpha + u^i)$  that, clearly, satisfies  $\tilde{u}^i \in U_{sing}^i$ .

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be any involutive distribution of corank two in  $TX$  such that  $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{G}^{k-2}$ . Fix  $l \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $l \notin \mathcal{C}^{k-2}$  and put

$$U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}(x) = \left\{ u^{k-2}(x) = (u_0^{k-2}(x), u_1^{k-2}(x))^\top : [f + u_0^{k-2} g_0 + u_1^{k-2} g_1, l] \in \mathcal{G}^{k-2} \right\}.$$

If  $\mathcal{G}^0(x^*) \not\subset \mathcal{L}(x^*)$ , where  $x^*$  is a nominal point around which we work, then the controls  $u^{k-2}(x)$  exist, are smooth, and (for any fixed  $x \in X$ ) form a 1-dimensional affine subset of  $U = \mathbb{R}^2$  because  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  is of corank one in  $TX$  and either  $[g_0, l]$  or  $[g_1, l]$  is not in  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$ . If  $\mathcal{G}^0(x^*) \subset \mathcal{L}(x^*)$ , then under the assumption, which we will always assume,  $(d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_0 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_1)(x^*, u^*) \neq 0$ , where the functions  $\varphi_0$  and  $\varphi_1$  are such that  $\mathcal{L}^\perp = \text{span}\{d\varphi_0, d\varphi_1\}$ , we have  $u^* \notin U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}(x^*)$  and in  $\mathcal{X}^* \times \mathbb{R}^2$ , where  $\mathcal{X}^*$  is a sufficiently small neighborhood of  $x^*$ , the set  $U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}(x)$  consists of two connected components that define, for each fixed value  $x \in \mathcal{X}^*$ ,  $x \neq x^*$ , an affine subspace of  $U = \mathbb{R}^2$ .

Clearly  $U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}$  is feedback invariant and does not depend on the choice of  $l \in \mathcal{L}$  but it depends on the distribution  $\mathcal{L}$ . Define

$$U_{sing}^{k-2} = \bigcap_{\mathcal{L}} U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}$$

where the intersection is taken over all  $\mathcal{L}$  as above, that is, involutive distribution of corank two in  $TX$ , satisfying  $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{G}^{k-2}$ . Define

$$U_{sing} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k-3} U_{sing}^i \cup U_{sing}^{k-2}$$

and

$$U_{\mathcal{L}-sing} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k-3} U_{sing}^i \cup U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}.$$

We will use both sets in Theorem 3 describing controls singular for flatness and in Proposition 1 comparing flat outputs of the triangular form  $TCh_1^k$  with those of the associated chained form  $Ch_1^k$ .

**Theorem 3:** Consider a two-input control-affine system  $\Sigma_{aff} : \dot{x} = f(x) + u_0 g_0(x) + u_1 g_1(x)$ , defined on an open subset  $X$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ , where  $k+1 \geq 4$ . Assume that  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is locally, around  $x^* \in X$ , static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$ . Then we have:

- (F1)  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is  $x$ -flat at any  $(x^*, u^*) \in X \times \mathbb{R}^2$  such that  $u^* \notin U_{sing}(x^*)$ .
- (F2) Let  $\varphi_0, \varphi_1$  be two smooth functions defined in a neighborhood  $\mathcal{X}$  of  $x^*$  and  $g$  be an arbitrary vector field in  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $g(x^*) \notin \mathcal{C}^{k-2}(x^*)$ . Then the following conditions are equivalent in  $\mathcal{X}$ :
- (i) The pair  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  is an  $x$ -flat output of  $\Sigma_{aff}$  at  $(x^*, u^*) \in \mathcal{X}^* \times \mathbb{R}^2$ , where  $\mathcal{X}^*$  is a neighborhood of  $x^*$ ;
  - (ii) The pair  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  satisfies the following conditions:
    - (FO1)  $(d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_0 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_1)(x^*, u^*) \neq 0$ , where  $\dot{\varphi}_i = L_{F_{aff}}\varphi_i$ , for  $i = 0, 1$  and  $F_{aff} = f + u_0g_0 + u_1g_1$ ;
    - (FO2)  $L_c\varphi_0 = L_c\varphi_1 = 0$  and  $(L_g\varphi_0)(L_{[c,g]}\varphi_1) - (L_g\varphi_1)(L_{[c,g]}\varphi_0) = 0$ , for any  $c \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2}$ ;
    - (FO3)  $u^* \notin U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}(x^*)$ , where  $\mathcal{L} = (\text{span}\{d\varphi_0, d\varphi_1\})^\perp$ .
  - (iii) The pair  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  satisfies the following conditions:
    - (FO1)'  $(d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_0 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_1)(x^*, u^*) \neq 0$ , where  $\dot{\varphi}_i = L_{F_{aff}}\varphi_i$ , for  $i = 0, 1$ , and  $F_{aff} = f + u_0g_0 + u_1g_1$ ;
    - (FO2)'  $\mathcal{L} = (\text{span}\{d\varphi_0, d\varphi_1\})^\perp \subset \mathcal{G}^{k-2}$ ;
    - (FO3)'  $u^* \notin U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}(x^*)$ .

Notice that since  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is locally, around  $x^*$ , static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$ , its associated control-linear system  $\Sigma_{lin} : \dot{x} = u_0g_0(x) + u_1g_1(x)$  is locally, around  $x^*$ , static feedback equivalent to the chained form  $Ch_1^k$ . The next result shows how the similarities and differences between two-input control-linear systems and control-affine systems locally equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$  are reflected by their flatness. It turns out that flat outputs of  $\Sigma_{lin}$  are flat outputs of  $\Sigma_{aff}$  (independently of the choice of  $f$  although singular control values depend on  $f$ ) and most of flat outputs of  $\Sigma_{aff}$  are flat outputs of the corresponding  $\Sigma_{lin}$  but not all, as the following proposition explains. Define

$$U_{char}(x) = \left\{ u(x) = (u_0(x), u_1(x))^\top : (u_0g_0 + u_1g_1)(x) \in \mathcal{C}^1(x) \right\}.$$

**Proposition 1:** Consider a two-input control-affine system  $\Sigma_{aff} : \dot{x} = f(x) + u_0g_0(x) + u_1g_1(x)$ , defined on an open subset  $X$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ , where  $k+1 \geq 4$ , and its associated control-linear system  $\Sigma_{lin} : \dot{x} = u_0g_0(x) + u_1g_1(x)$ . Assume that  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is locally, around  $x^* \in X$ , static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$ . Then we have:

- (F3)  $\Sigma_{lin}$  is  $x$ -flat at any  $(x^*, u^*) \in X \times \mathbb{R}^2$  such that  $u^* \notin U_{char}(x^*)$ .
- (F4) A pair  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  of smooth functions defined in a neighborhood  $\mathcal{X}$  of  $x^*$  is an  $x$ -flat output of  $\Sigma_{lin}$  at  $(x^*, u^*) \in \mathcal{X}^* \times \mathbb{R}^2$  such that  $\mathcal{X}^* \subset X$  is an open neighborhood of  $x^*$  and  $u^* \notin U_{char}(x^*)$  if and only if it satisfies the conditions (FO1)-(FO2) or, equivalently, (FO1)'-(FO2)' of Theorem 3, where  $\dot{\varphi}_i$ , for  $i = 0, 1$ , is understood as  $\dot{\varphi}_i = L_{F_{lin}}\varphi_i$  and  $F_{lin} = u_0g_0 + u_1g_1$ ;
- (F5) If  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  is a flat output of  $\Sigma_{lin}$  at  $(x^*, u^*)$ , where  $u^* \notin U_{char}(x^*)$ , then  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  is a flat output of  $\Sigma_{aff}$  at  $(x^*, \tilde{u}^*)$ , where  $\tilde{u}^* \notin U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}(x^*)$  with  $\mathcal{L} = (\text{span}\{d\varphi_0, d\varphi_1\})^\perp$ .
- (F6) Let  $g$  be an arbitrary vector field in  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $g(x^*) \notin \mathcal{C}^{k-2}(x^*)$ . If  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  is a flat output of  $\Sigma_{aff}$  at  $(x^*, \tilde{u}^*)$ , where  $\tilde{u}^* \notin U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}(x^*)$ , with  $\mathcal{L} = (\text{span}\{d\varphi_0, d\varphi_1\})^\perp$ , and satisfies  $(L_g\varphi_0, L_g\varphi_1)(x^*) \neq (0, 0)$ , then  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  is a flat output of  $\Sigma_{lin}$  at  $(x^*, u^*)$ , where  $u^* \notin U_{char}(x^*)$ .

For a pair of functions  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$ , the conditions to be a flat output are, formally, the same for  $\Sigma_{aff}$  and the associated control-linear system  $\Sigma_{lin}$  and are given by (FO1)-(FO2) (or, equivalently, by (FO1)'-(FO2)'). Notice, however, that the vector field along which we differentiate changes from  $F_{aff}$  into  $F_{lin}$  and thus the conditions change as well. This implies that there is more flat outputs for  $\Sigma_{aff}$  than for the associated  $\Sigma_{lin}$ . Actually, the condition (FO1) applied to  $\Sigma_{lin}$  implies that  $(L_g\varphi_0, L_g\varphi_1)(x^*) \neq (0, 0)$  (thus obtaining the same necessary and sufficient conditions as those given in (Li and Respondek, 2012) for two-input control-linear systems), whereas (FO1) applied

to  $\Sigma_{aff}$  still admits systems for which  $(L_g\varphi_0, L_g\varphi_1)(x^*) = (0, 0)$  as the following example shows.

**Example 1:** Consider the control-affine system:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{z}_0 &= v_0 & \dot{z}_1 &= z_0 + z_2 v_0 \\ \dot{z}_2 &= z_3 v_0 \\ &\vdots \\ \dot{z}_{k-1} &= z_k v_0 \\ \dot{z}_k &= v_1\end{aligned}$$

which is in the triangular form compatible with the chained form  $TCh_1^k$ . We claim that it is  $x$ -flat with  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1) = (z_1 - z_0 z_2, z_2)$  as  $x$ -flat output around  $z^* = 0$ , although  $(L_g\varphi_0, L_g\varphi_1)(0) = (0, 0)$ , for any vector field in  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $g(z^*) \notin \mathcal{C}^{k-2}(z^*)$ , provided that  $v_0^* \neq 0$  and  $(1 - z_3^* v_0^*) \neq 0$ , the latter condition being always satisfied at  $z^* = 0$ , but not in a neighborhood.

Indeed, we have  $\dot{\varphi}_0 = z_0 - z_0 z_3 v_0$ ,  $\dot{\varphi}_1 = z_3 v_0$  and it follows that  $\dot{\varphi}_0 = z_0(1 - \dot{\varphi}_1)$ , from which we deduce  $z_0 = \frac{\dot{\varphi}_0}{1 - \dot{\varphi}_1}$ , provided that  $1 - \dot{\varphi}_1 = 1 - z_3^* v_0^* \neq 0$ . By differentiating that relation, we get  $v_0 = \dot{z}_0 = \frac{d}{dt}(\frac{\dot{\varphi}_0}{1 - \dot{\varphi}_1}) = \delta_0(\bar{\varphi}_0^2, \bar{\varphi}_1^2)$ , where  $\bar{\varphi}_i^j = (\varphi_i, \dot{\varphi}_i, \dots, \varphi_i^{(j)})$ . From  $\dot{\varphi}_1 = z_3 v_0$ , we compute  $z_3 = \frac{\dot{\varphi}_1}{v_0} = \gamma_3(\bar{\varphi}_0^2, \bar{\varphi}_1^2)$ . Then,  $\dot{z}_3$  gives  $z_4 = \gamma_4(\bar{\varphi}_0^3, \bar{\varphi}_1^3)$  and so on. Finally we get  $z_k = \gamma_k(\bar{\varphi}_0^{k-1}, \bar{\varphi}_1^{k-1})$  and  $v_1 = \delta_1(\bar{\varphi}_0^k, \bar{\varphi}_1^k)$ . Thus  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1) = (z_1 - z_0 z_2, z_2)$  is indeed an  $x$ -flat output of the system around  $z^* = 0$  such that  $z_3^* v_0^* \neq 1$ .

Let us now consider the chained form  $Ch_1^k$  and take  $g = g_0$ . We compute  $L_g\varphi_0 = -z_0 z_3 v_0$ ,  $L_g\varphi_1 = z_3 v_0$  and we clearly have  $(L_g\varphi_0, L_g\varphi_1)(0) = (0, 0)$ . Since the condition  $(L_g\varphi_0, L_g\varphi_1)(z^*) \neq (0, 0)$  is necessary for  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  to be an  $x$ -flat output for the chained form, see (Li and Respondek, 2012), we deduce that  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1) = (z_1 - z_0 z_2, z_2)$  is not an  $x$ -flat output at  $z^* = 0$  for  $Ch_1^k$ .  $\square$

For control-linear systems  $\Sigma_{lin}$ , the choice of a flat output is not unique (different choices are parameterized by an arbitrary function of three variables whose differentials annihilate  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2}$ , as assures Proposition 2 below) but all flat outputs exhibit the same singularity in control space (see item (F4) of Proposition 1), which is the control  $u_c$ , where  $u_c \in U_{char}$  such that  $u_{c,0}g_0 + u_{c,1}g_1 \in \mathcal{C}^1$  (for any  $x \in X$ , it defines a one-dimensional linear subspace of  $U = \mathbb{R}^2$ ). In the control-affine case, the nature of singularities changes substantially: each choice of a flat output creates its own singularities in the control space. More precisely, a flat output  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  ceases to be a flat output for controls  $u^*$  belonging to  $U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}$  which is the union of  $\bigcup_{i=0}^{k-3} U_{sing}^i$  (universal for all choices of  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  and consisting, for each fixed  $x \in X$ , of the union of  $k-2$  one-dimensional affine subspaces of  $U = \mathbb{R}^2$ ) and of  $U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}$ , which is a one-dimensional affine subspace of  $U = \mathbb{R}^2$  that depends on  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  since  $\mathcal{L} = (\text{span}\{d\varphi_0, d\varphi_1\})^\perp$ . All those  $k-1$  affine subspaces are, in general, different although some of them may coincide and, indeed, in the control-linear case all of them coincide and reduce to the linear-space of  $U = \mathbb{R}^2$  containing the characteristic controls  $u_c$  that correspond to the characteristic distribution  $\mathcal{C}^1$ , that is, the corresponding trajectories remain tangent to  $\mathcal{C}^1$ . Moreover, if we apply an invertible feedback  $u = \beta\tilde{u}$  (which always exists and can be explicitly calculated) such that  $\mathcal{C}^1 = \text{span}\{\tilde{g}_1\}$  and  $\mathcal{G}^0 = \text{span}\{\tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g}_1\}$ , a control  $\tilde{u}_c$  is characteristic, that is, singular for flatness of  $\Sigma_{lin}$ , if and only if the feedback modified control is  $\tilde{u}_c = \beta^{(-1)}u_c = (0, \tilde{u}_{c,1})^T$ .

Now it is clear that the control-affine system  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is flat if we avoid the universal singular set  $\bigcup_{i=0}^{k-3} U_{sing}^i$  as well as the set singular for all choices of flat outputs  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$ , that is the set  $\bigcap_{\mathcal{L}-sing} U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}$  (the intersection taken over all  $\mathcal{L}$ ), which explains different statements for a fixed choice of  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  in item (F2)(ii) and an arbitrary choice of  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  in item (F1).

Notice that Theorem 3 is valid for any  $k \geq 3$  (thus for a system defined on a manifold  $X$  of dimension at least 4). In fact, in item (ii), we use the characteristic distribution  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2}$  of  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$ , but if  $\dim X = 3$ , i.e.,  $k = 2$ , such a distribution does not exist and item (ii) does not apply to that case. Item (iii), however, is well defined even for  $\dim X = 3$  and remains equivalent to (i).

As an immediate corollary of Theorem 3, we obtain a system of first order PDE's, described by Proposition 2 below, whose solutions give all  $x$ -flat outputs. Like for systems equivalent to the chained form (see (Li and Respondek, 2012)),  $x$ -flat outputs for the systems feedback equivalent to the triangular form  $TCh_1^k$  are far from being unique: since the distribution  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2}$  is involutive and of corank three, there are as many functions  $\varphi_0$  satisfying  $L_c\varphi_0 = 0$ , for any  $c \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2}$ , as functions of three variables. Indeed, according to the following proposition,  $\varphi_0$  can be chosen as any function of the three independent functions, whose differentials annihilate  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2}$ , and if moreover,  $\langle d\varphi_0, \mathcal{G}^0 \rangle(x^*) \neq 0$ , then there exists a unique  $\varphi_1$  (up to a diffeomorphism) completing it to an  $x$ -flat output.

**Proposition 2:** *Consider a two-input control-affine system  $\Sigma_{aff} : \dot{x} = f(x) + u_0g_0(x) + u_1g_1(x)$ , defined on a manifold  $X$ , of dimension  $k+1 \geq 4$ , that is locally, around  $x^* \in X$ , static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2} = \text{span}\{c_1, \dots, c_{k-2}\}$  be the characteristic distribution of  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  such that  $c_{k-2}(x^*) \notin \mathcal{C}^{k-3}(x^*)$  and  $g$  be an arbitrary vector field in  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $g(x^*) \notin \mathcal{C}^{k-2}(x^*)$ . Then*

(i) *For any smooth function  $\varphi_0$  such that*

$$(\text{Flat } 1) \quad L_{c_i}\varphi_0 = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k-2, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle d\varphi_0, \mathcal{G}^{k-2} \rangle(x^*) \neq 0,$$

*the distribution  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{C}^{k-2} + \text{span}\{v\}$  is involutive, where  $v = (L_g\varphi_0)[c_{k-2}, g] - (L_{[c_{k-2}, g]}\varphi_0)g$ .*

(ii) *A pair  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  of smooth functions defined on a neighborhood of  $x^*$  is an  $x$ -flat output at  $(x^*, u^*)$  with  $u^* \notin U_{\mathcal{L}-\text{sing}}(x^*)$ , if and only if (after permuting  $\varphi_0$  and  $\varphi_1$ , if necessary)  $\varphi_0$  is any function satisfying (Flat 1) and  $\varphi_1$  satisfies*

$$(\text{Flat } 2) \quad \begin{cases} (d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_0 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_1)(x^*, u^*) \neq 0, \\ L_{c_i}\varphi_1 = 0, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k-2, \\ L_v\varphi_1 = 0. \end{cases}$$

(iii) *If in (Flat 1), we replace  $\langle d\varphi_0, \mathcal{G}^{k-2} \rangle(x^*) \neq 0$  by  $\langle d\varphi_0, \mathcal{G}^0 \rangle(x^*) \neq 0$ , then for any function  $\varphi_0$  satisfying  $L_c\varphi_0 = 0$ , for any  $c \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2}$ , and  $\langle d\varphi_0, \mathcal{G}^0 \rangle(x^*) \neq 0$ , there always exists  $\varphi_1$  such that the pair  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  is an  $x$ -flat output of  $\Sigma_{aff}$ ; given any such  $\varphi_0$ , the choice of  $\varphi_1$  is unique, up to a diffeomorphism, that is, if  $(\varphi_0, \tilde{\varphi}_1)$  is another minimal  $x$ -flat output, then there exists a smooth map  $h$ , smoothly invertible with respect to the second argument, such that*

$$\tilde{\varphi}_1 = h(\varphi_0, \varphi_1).$$

*Remark.* Notice that for a function  $\varphi_0$  satisfying  $\langle d\varphi_0, \mathcal{G}^{k-2} \rangle(x^*) \neq 0$  (and not the stronger condition  $\langle d\varphi_0, \mathcal{G}^0 \rangle(x^*) \neq 0$ , or equivalently  $L_g\varphi_0(x^*) \neq 0$ , see Proposition 2(iii)), it can be impossible to find, among all solutions of  $L_{c_i}\varphi_1 = L_v\varphi_1 = 0$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k-2$ , a function  $\varphi_1$  satisfying  $(d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_0 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_1)(x^*, u^*) \neq 0$  and therefore item (iii) does not hold, in general, under the weaker condition  $\langle d\varphi_0, \mathcal{G}^{k-2} \rangle(x^*) \neq 0$ . This is, for example, the case of control-linear systems.

As expected, the system of PDE's allowing us to compute all  $x$ -flat outputs of a system locally static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$  does not depend on the drift  $f$  and it is the same as that provided in (Li and Respondek, 2012) for  $x$ -flat outputs in the case of control-linear  $\Sigma_{lin}$  feedback equivalent to the chained form. For more details and the proof of Proposition 2 in the case  $L_g\varphi_0(x^*) \neq 0$ , we refer the reader to (Li and Respondek, 2012).

Finally, it turns out that almost all  $x$ -flat outputs are compatible with the triangular form  $TCh_1^k$  (as are  $x$ -flat outputs of the chained form). In fact, for any given flat output  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  of a system  $\Sigma_{aff}$  feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$ , verifying  $(L_g\varphi_0, L_g\varphi_1)(x^*) \neq (0, 0)$ , we can bring  $\Sigma_{aff}$  into  $TCh_1^k$  for which  $\varphi_0$  and  $\varphi_1$  serve as the two top variables, as the following proposition assures. The following result is technical and will be useful in our proofs, but it has its own interest.

**Proposition 3:** Assume that  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is locally, around  $x^*$ , static feedback equivalent to the triangular form  $TCh_1^k$  and let  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  be an  $x$ -flat output around  $(x^*, u^*)$ , such that  $(L_g\varphi_0, L_g\varphi_1)(x^*) \neq (0, 0)$ , where  $g$  is an arbitrary vector field in  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $g(x^*) \notin \mathcal{C}^{k-2}(x^*)$ . Then we can bring  $\Sigma_{aff}$  to  $TCh_1^k$  around  $z^*$  such that  $z_0 = \varphi_0$  and  $z_1 = \varphi_1$  (after permuting  $\varphi_0$  and  $\varphi_1$ , if necessary).

*Remark.* The above proposition is valid around  $z^*$  which is not necessary equal to 0. If we want to map  $x^*$  into  $z^* = 0$ , then an affine transformation of flat outputs may be needed. More precisely, we can bring  $\Sigma_{aff}$  to  $TCh_1^k$  around  $z^* = 0$  such that  $z_0 = \varphi_0$  and  $z_1 = \varphi_1 + k_0\varphi_0$  (after permuting  $\varphi_0$  and  $\varphi_1$ ), where  $k_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ .

## 4.2 Flatness of control systems static feedback equivalent to $TCh_m^k$

We now turn to the case  $m \geq 2$ . It is clear that  $TCh_m^k$  is  $x$ -flat, with  $\varphi = (z_0, z_1^1, \dots, z_m^1)$  being a flat output, at any point  $(z^*, v^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{km+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$  satisfying

$$\text{rk } F^l(z^*, v^*) = m, \text{ for } 1 \leq l \leq k-1,$$

where  $F^l = (F_{ij}^l)$ , for  $1 \leq l \leq k-1$ , is the  $m \times m$  matrix given by

$$F_{ij}^l = \frac{\partial(f_j^l + z_j^{l+1}v_0)}{\partial z_i^{l+1}}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i, j \leq m.$$

Therefore, flat systems equivalent to  $TCh_m^k$  exhibit singularities in the control space (depending on the state) defined in an invariant way by

$$U_{m-sing}(x) = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k-2} U_{m-sing}^i(x),$$

where

$$U_{m-sing}^i(x) = \{u(x) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \text{rk}(\mathcal{G}^i + [f + gu, \mathcal{L}^{i+1}])(x) < (i+2)m+1\},$$

with  $\mathcal{L}^{i+1} = \mathcal{C}^{i+1}$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq k-3$ , where  $\mathcal{C}^{i+1}$  is the characteristic distribution of  $\mathcal{G}^{i+1}$ , and  $\mathcal{L}^{k-1} = \mathcal{L}$ , the involutive subdistribution of  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  and  $gu = \sum_{i=0}^m u_i g_i$ . This singularity is excluded by item (m-F1) of the next theorem describing all minimal  $x$ -flat outputs of control-affine systems feedback equivalent to the triangular form  $TCh_m^k$ .

**Theorem 4:** Consider a control-affine system  $\Sigma_{aff} : \dot{x} = f(x) + \sum_{i=0}^m u_i g_i(x)$ , with  $m \geq 2$ , defined on an open subset  $X$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{km+1}$ , where  $k \geq 2$ , that is locally, around  $x^* \in X$ , static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_m^k$  and its associated control-linear system  $\Sigma_{lin} : \dot{x} = \sum_{i=0}^m u_i g_i(x)$ .

- (m-F1)  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is  $x$ -flat, of differential weight  $(k+1)(m+1)$ , at any  $(x^*, u^*) \in X \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$  such that  $u^* \notin U_{m-sing}(x^*)$ .
- (m-F2) If  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m)$  is a minimal  $x$ -flat output of  $\Sigma_{aff}$  at  $(x^*, u^*)$ , where  $u^* \notin U_{m-sing}(x^*)$ , then there exists an open neighborhood  $\mathcal{X}^*$  of  $x^*$  and coordinates  $(z_0, z_1^1, \dots, z_m^1, \dots, z_1^k, \dots, z_m^k)$  on  $\mathcal{X}^*$  in which  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is locally feedback equivalent to the triangular form  $TCh_m^k$ , such that  $\varphi_0 = z_0$  and  $\varphi_i = z_i^1$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , after permuting the components  $\varphi_i$  of the flat output  $\varphi$ , if necessary.
- (m-F3) Let  $\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$  be  $m+1$  smooth functions defined in a neighborhood of  $x^*$ . The following conditions are equivalent:
  - (i) The  $(m+1)$ -tuple  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m)$  is a minimal  $x$ -flat output of  $\Sigma_{aff}$  at  $(x^*, u^*)$ , where  $u^* \notin U_{m-sing}(x^*)$ ;

- (ii) The  $(m+1)$ -tuple  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m)$  is a minimal  $x$ -flat output of  $\Sigma_{lin}$  at  $(x^*, \tilde{u}^*)$ , where  $\tilde{u}^*$  is such that  $\sum_{i=0}^m \tilde{u}_i^* g_i(x^*) \notin \mathcal{C}^1(x^*)$ , where  $\mathcal{C}^1$  is the characteristic distribution of  $\mathcal{G}^1$ ;
- (iii) The  $(m+1)$ -tuple  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m)$  satisfies the following conditions in a neighborhood of  $x^*$ :
  - (m-FO1)  $d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge d\varphi_m(x^*) \neq 0$ ;
  - (m-FO2)  $\mathcal{L} = (\text{span}\{d\varphi_0, d\varphi_1, \dots, d\varphi_m\})^\perp$ , where  $\mathcal{L}$  denotes the involutive subdistribution of corank one in  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$ .

Moreover, the  $(m+1)$ -tuple  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m)$  is unique, up to a diffeomorphism, i.e., if  $(\tilde{\varphi}_0, \tilde{\varphi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\varphi}_m)$  is another minimal  $x$ -flat output, then there exist smooth maps  $h_i$  such that  $\tilde{\varphi}_i = h_i(\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m)$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , and  $h = (h_0, h_1, \dots, h_m)$  is a local diffeomorphism.

Theorem 4 indicates how flatness of control-affine systems locally equivalent to  $TCh_m^k$  reminds, but also how it differs from, that of control-linear systems locally equivalent to the  $m$ -chained form  $Ch_m^k$ .

While Theorem 3, associated to the case  $m = 1$ , allows us to compute all  $x$ -flat outputs of  $TCh_1^k$ , Theorem 4 describes all minimal  $x$ -flat outputs of  $TCh_m^k$ . Functions whose differentials annihilate  $\mathcal{L}$  are clearly not the only  $x$ -flat outputs of  $TCh_m^k$ . They are, however, the only that possess the minimality property, i.e., when determining, with their help, all state and control variables, we use the minimal possible number of derivatives, which is  $(k+1)(m+1)$ , see the proof of Theorem 4. According to item (ii), their description coincides with that of minimal  $x$ -flat outputs of  $\Sigma_{lin}$ . Indeed, conditions (m-FO1)-(m-FO2) are the same as those given in (Respondek, 2003) for control-linear systems feedback equivalent to the  $m$ -chained form. The presence of the drift has no influence on characterizing minimal  $x$ -flat outputs, but, analogously to the case  $m = 1$ , it plays a role in describing singularities in the control space.

As for the characterization of the  $m$ -chained form and, consequently, of control-affine systems static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_m^k$ , the involutive subdistribution  $\mathcal{L}$  of corank one in  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  is crucial for minimal  $x$ -flat outputs computation. Indeed, all minimal  $x$ -flat outputs are determined by  $\mathcal{L}$ . In contrast with the case  $m = 1$ , where the choice of  $x$ -flat outputs is parameterized by a function of three well chosen variables, minimal  $x$ -flat outputs of  $TCh_m^k$  are unique (as they are for the  $m$ -chained form). This is a consequence of the uniqueness of the involutive subdistribution  $\mathcal{L}$  of corank one in  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$ , in the case  $m \geq 2$ , and multiple noncanonical choices of  $\mathcal{L}$ , if  $m = 1$ .

For control-affine systems, it is the drift  $f$ , the characteristic distributions  $\mathcal{C}^i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq k-2$ , and the involutive subdistribution  $\mathcal{L}$  of corank one in  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$ , that describe singularities in the control space. Although  $\mathcal{L}$  is not involved in the compatibility conditions (see item (m-Comp) of Theorem 2), it plays an important role in determining the singular controls at which the system ceases to be flat.

The description of the set of singular controls  $U_{m-sing}$  is also valid for driftless systems, i.e., for  $f = 0$ , but it is redundant. In fact, the set of singular controls  $u_c$  for control-linear systems can be described using the first characteristic distribution  $\mathcal{C}^1$  only: the singular controls  $u_c$  are such that the corresponding trajectories are tangent to the characteristic distribution  $\mathcal{C}^1$ , that is,  $u_c$  verifying  $\sum_{i=0}^m u_{c,i}(x)g_i(x) \in \mathcal{C}^1(x)$ . Clearly, they form, for any  $x \in X$ , an  $m$ -dimensional linear subspace of  $U = \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ . If we apply an invertible feedback  $u = \beta \tilde{u}$  such that  $\mathcal{C}^1 = \text{span}\{\tilde{g}_1, \dots, \tilde{g}_m\}$  and  $\mathcal{G}^0 = \text{span}\{\tilde{g}_0\} + \mathcal{C}^1$ , then the singular controls  $\tilde{u}_c$  are of the form  $\tilde{u}_c = (0, \tilde{u}_{c,1}, \dots, \tilde{u}_{c,m})$ .

Finally, it turns out that minimal  $x$ -flat outputs and the triangular form  $TCh_m^k$  are compatible: in fact, for any  $m+1$  smooth functions  $\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$  that form a minimal  $x$ -flat output of a system  $\Sigma_{aff}$  feedback equivalent to  $TCh_m^k$ , we can bring  $\Sigma_{aff}$  into the form  $TCh_m^k$  for which  $\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$  play the role of the top variables, as item (m-F2) assures. An analogous result is also valid for minimal  $x$ -flat outputs and the  $m$ -chained form, see (Li and Respondek, 2011).

As an immediate corollary of Theorem 4, we get the following system of PDE's whose solutions

give all minimal  $x$ -flat outputs for control-affine systems static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_m^k$ . Denote by  $v_j$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq (k-1)m$ , the vector fields spanning the distribution  $\mathcal{L}$  (for their computation see Appendix A).

**Proposition 4:** *Consider a control-affine system  $\Sigma_{aff} : \dot{x} = f(x) + \sum_{i=0}^m u_i g_i(x)$ , with  $m \geq 2$ , defined on an open subset  $X$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{km+1}$ , where  $k \geq 2$ , that is locally, around  $x^* \in X$ , static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_m^k$ . Let  $\mathcal{L} = \text{span}\{v_j, 1 \leq j \leq (k-1)m\}$  be the involutive subdistribution of corank one in  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$ . Then smooth functions  $\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$ , defined in a neighborhood of  $x^*$ , form a minimal  $x$ -flat output at  $(x^*, u^*)$ ,  $u^* \notin U_{m-sing}(x^*)$  if and only if*

$$L_{v_j} \varphi_i = 0, 1 \leq j \leq (k-1)m, 0 \leq i \leq m,$$

and  $d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge d\varphi_m(x^*) \neq 0$ .

## 5. Examples and applications

### 5.1 Example: $TCh_1^k$ is not necessary for flatness

In the previous section we have seen that systems locally static feedback equivalent to the triangular form to  $TCh_m^k$ ,  $m = 1$  or  $m \geq 2$ , are  $x$ -flat and we have described all  $x$ -flat outputs. Therefore being static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_m^k$ ,  $m = 1$  or  $m \geq 2$  is sufficient for  $x$ -flatness. A natural question arises: is static feedback equivalence to  $TCh_m^k$  necessary for flatness, provided that the control-linear subsystem is static feedback equivalent to the chained form? The next example gives a negative answer to this question. Consider the following control-affine system whose control-linear part is already in the chained form  $Ch_1^4$ , but whose drift  $f$  does not satisfy the compatibility condition (*Comp*) and thus the system cannot be transformed into  $TCh_1^4$ :

$$\begin{cases} \dot{z}_0 = v_0 & \dot{z}_1 = z_3 + z_2 v_0 \\ & \dot{z}_2 = -z_4 + z_3 v_0 \\ & \dot{z}_3 = a(z_3) + z_4 v_0 \\ & \dot{z}_4 = v_1 \end{cases}$$

where  $a$  is a smooth function depending on  $z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3$ . The pair  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1) = (z_0, z_1)$  is an  $x$ -flat output. Indeed, we have  $\varphi_0 = z_0$  implying  $\dot{\varphi}_0 = v_0$  and  $\varphi_1 = z_1$  implying

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\varphi}_1 &= z_3 + z_2 v_0 = z_3 + z_2 \dot{\varphi}_0 \\ \ddot{\varphi}_1 &= a(\varphi_0, \varphi_1, z_2, z_3) + z_3 \dot{\varphi}_0^2 + z_2 \ddot{\varphi}_0. \end{aligned}$$

These expressions allow us to calculate  $z_2$  and  $z_3$  via the implicit function theorem as

$$\begin{aligned} z_2 &= \gamma_2(\bar{\varphi}_0^2, \bar{\varphi}_1^2) \\ z_3 &= \gamma_3(\bar{\varphi}_0^2, \bar{\varphi}_1^2), \end{aligned}$$

for some functions  $\gamma_2, \gamma_3$ , where  $\bar{\varphi}^l$  denotes  $(\varphi, \dot{\varphi}, \dots, \varphi^{(l)})$ . By differentiating  $z_3$ , we deduce  $z_4 = \gamma_4(\bar{\varphi}_0^3, \bar{\varphi}_1^3)$  which yields  $v_1 = \delta_1(\bar{\varphi}_0^4, \bar{\varphi}_1^4)$ . So we have expressed all state and control variables as functions of  $\varphi_0$  and  $\varphi_1$  and their derivatives proving that  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1) = (z_0, z_1)$  is, indeed, an  $x$ -flat output.

## 5.2 Application to mechanical systems: coin rolling without slipping on a moving table

Consider a vertical coin of radius  $R$  rolling without slipping on a moving table, see Figure 1. Assume that the surface of the table is on the  $xy$ -plane and denote by  $(x, y)$  the position of the contact point of the coin with the table, and by  $\theta$  and  $\phi$ , respectively, the orientation of the vertical plane containing the coin and the rotation angle of the coin. Then the configuration space for the system is  $Q = SE(2) \times S^1$  and is parameterized by the generalized coordinates  $q = ((x, y, \theta), \phi)$ .




Figure 1. The coin on a moving table

Assume that the table moves with respect to the inertial frame obeying the differential equations

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_t &= \alpha(x_t, y_t) \\ \dot{y}_t &= \beta(x_t, y_t).\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

for a smooth vector field  $(\alpha, \beta)^\top$  on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

Therefore the nonholonomic constraints of rolling without slipping can be represented by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} \sin \theta - \dot{y} \cos \theta &= 0 \\ (\dot{x} - \alpha) \cos \theta + (\dot{y} - \beta) \sin \theta &= R\dot{\phi},\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

which leads to the kinematic model of the coin on a moving table as

$$\Sigma_{coin} : \begin{pmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{y} \\ \dot{\theta} \\ \dot{\phi} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta (\alpha \cos \theta + \beta \sin \theta) \\ \sin \theta (\alpha \cos \theta + \beta \sin \theta) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} u_1 + \begin{pmatrix} R \cos \theta \\ R \sin \theta \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} u_2.\tag{5}$$

The system is control-affine because the nonholonomic constraints are affine (and not linear) as a result of the motion of the table with respect to the inertial frame.

**Remark 1:** Assume that  $\alpha = -\omega y_t$ ,  $\beta = \omega x_t$ , that is, the motion equation of the table is

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_t &= -\omega y_t \\ \dot{y}_t &= \omega x_t,\end{aligned}$$

meaning that the table rotates around its center point with the angular velocity  $\omega$ . Substituting  $\alpha = -\omega y$ ,  $\beta = \omega x$  into (5), we obtain the model of the coin on a rotating table as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{y} \\ \dot{\theta} \\ \dot{\phi} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \omega \cos \theta (x \sin \theta - y \cos \theta) \\ \omega \sin \theta (x \sin \theta - y \cos \theta) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} u_1 + \begin{pmatrix} R \cos \theta \\ R \sin \theta \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} u_2,\tag{6}$$

which coincides with the model given by (Kai, 2006).

**Proposition 5:** *The coin on a moving table  $\Sigma_{\text{coin}}$ , given by (5), is feedback equivalent to the triangular form  $TCh_1^3$  if and only if the motion of the table is described by*

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_t = cy_t + d \\ \dot{y}_t = -cx_t + e \end{cases}$$

where  $c, d, e \in \mathbb{R}$  are constant.

**Remark 2:** Notice that introducing  $\tilde{x}_t = x_t - e/c$  and  $\tilde{y}_t = y_t + d/c$ , we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{x}}_t &= c\tilde{y}_t \\ \dot{\tilde{y}}_t &= -c\tilde{x}_t. \end{aligned}$$

The only motions of table that lead to the triangular form  $TCh_1^3$  are thus constant speed rotations around a fixed point  $(e/c, -d/c)$ .

*Proof.* The system  $\Sigma_{\text{coin}}$  is feedback equivalent to the triangular form  $TCh_1^k$  if and only if it satisfies the conditions  $(Ch1)$ – $(Ch3)$  and  $(Comp)$  of Theorem 2 or, equivalently, conditions  $(Ch1)'$ – $(Ch2)'$  and  $(Comp)$ . Consider the associated distribution  $\mathcal{G}$  and the drift  $f$  given by:

$$\mathcal{G} = \text{span}\{g_1, g_2\} = \text{span}\left\{\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} R \cos \theta \\ R \sin \theta \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}\right\} \text{ and } f = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta(\alpha \cos \theta + \beta \sin \theta) \\ \sin \theta(\alpha \cos \theta + \beta \sin \theta) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

A straightforward calculation shows that

$$g_3 = [g_1, g_2] = \begin{pmatrix} -R \sin \theta \\ R \cos \theta \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad g_4 = [g_1, g_3] = \begin{pmatrix} -R \cos \theta \\ -R \sin \theta \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore  $\mathcal{G}^1 = \mathcal{G}_1 = \text{span}\{g_1, g_2, g_3\}$  and  $\mathcal{G}^2 = \mathcal{G}_2 = \text{span}\{g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4\}$  which gives that  $\text{rk } \mathcal{G}^1 = \text{rk } \mathcal{G}_1 = 3$  and  $\text{rk } \mathcal{G}^2 = \text{rk } \mathcal{G}_2 = 4$  and thus conditions  $(Ch1)'$ – $(Ch2)'$  hold. Moreover, it is easy to see that  $\mathcal{C}^1 = \text{span}\{c\}$  where  $c = g_2$  and a direct computation gives

$$[f, c] = [f, g_2] = - \begin{pmatrix} \gamma R \cos \theta \\ \gamma R \sin \theta \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\gamma = \cos \theta \left( \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x} \cos \theta + \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial x} \sin \theta \right) + \sin \theta \left( \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial y} \cos \theta + \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial y} \sin \theta \right).$$

The condition  $(Comp)$  of Theorem 2 requires that  $[f, c] \subset \mathcal{G}^1$  implying that the vector fields  $[f, c]$  and  $g_3$  are colinear and this is the case if and only if  $\gamma \equiv 0$ . We thus have to solve

$$\cos \theta \left( \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x} \cos \theta + \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial x} \sin \theta \right) + \sin \theta \left( \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial y} \cos \theta + \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial y} \sin \theta \right) = 0.$$

Dividing the above equation by  $\cos^2 \theta$  and denoting  $w = \tan \theta$ , we get

$$\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x} + \left( \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial x} \right) w + \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial y} w^2 = 0,$$

which implies that

$$\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial x} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial y} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial y} = -\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial x}.$$

We get  $\alpha = \alpha(y)$ ,  $\beta = \beta(x)$  and then by the equality  $\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial y} = -\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial x}$ , we have

$$\alpha'(y) = -\beta'(x) = c,$$

where  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  is a constant. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= cy + d \\ \beta &= -cx + e \end{aligned}$$

where  $c, e, f \in \mathbb{R}$  are constants and the motion of the table is described by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_t &= cy_t + d \\ \dot{y}_t &= -cx_t + e, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

which proves the proposition.  $\square$

## 6. Proofs

### 6.1 Proof of Theorem 1

*Proof. Necessity.* Consider a two-input control-affine system  $\Sigma_{aff} : \dot{x} = f(x) + u_0 g_0(x) + u_1 g_1(x)$  locally, around  $x^*$ , static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$  and bring it into the form  $TCh_1^k$ , around  $z^*$ . By abuse of notation, we continue to denote by  $f$ ,  $g_0$  and  $g_1$ , the drift and the controlled vector fields of  $TCh_1^k$ . The distribution  $\mathcal{G} = \text{span}\{g_0, g_1\}$ , associated to  $TCh_1^k$ , is given by

$$\mathcal{G} = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_0} + z_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + \cdots + z_k \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-1}} \right\}.$$

By an induction argument, it is immediate to show that

$$\mathcal{G}^i = \mathcal{G}_i = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-i}}, \cdots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_0} + z_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + \cdots + z_{k-i} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-i-1}} \right\}.$$

Thus  $\mathcal{G}^{k-1} = TX$  and the distribution  $\mathcal{G}^{k-3}$  is of constant rank  $k-1$ . The characteristic distribution  $\mathcal{C}^i$  of  $\mathcal{G}^i$  is given by

$$\mathcal{C}^i = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-i+1}}, \cdots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k} \right\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k-2.$$

So it is immediate to see that  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2}$  is contained in  $\mathcal{G}^{k-3}$ , this inclusion is of corank one and  $\mathcal{G}^0(z^*) \not\subset \mathcal{C}^{k-2}(z^*)$ . This shows (Ch1)-(Ch3).

Moreover, we have

$$[\frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}, f] = \frac{\partial f_{k-1}}{\partial z_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-1}} \in \mathcal{G}^1$$

and

$$[\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-i+1}}, f] = \frac{\partial f_{k-i}}{\partial z_{k-i+1}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-i}} \bmod \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-i+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k} \right\},$$

which is clearly in  $\mathcal{G}^i$ , for any  $2 \leq i \leq k-2$ . It follows that  $[f, \mathcal{C}^i] \subset \mathcal{G}^i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq k-2$ , which shows  $(Comp)$ . The conditions  $(Ch1) - (Ch3)$  involve the distribution  $\mathcal{G}$  only, so they are invariant under feedback of the form  $g \rightarrow g\beta$ . Obviously,  $[g_j, \mathcal{C}^i] \in \mathcal{G}^i$  (since  $\mathcal{C}^i$  is characteristic for  $\mathcal{G}^i$ ), for  $0 \leq j \leq 1$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k-2$ , and thus  $(Comp)$  is invariant under feedback of the form  $f \mapsto f + \alpha_0 g_0 + \alpha_1 g_1$ .

*Sufficiency.* Consider a two-input control-affine system  $\Sigma_{aff} : \dot{x} = f(x) + u_0 g_0(x) + u_1 g_1(x)$  satisfying the conditions  $(Ch1)-(Ch3)$  and  $(Comp)$ . As proved in (Pasillas-Lépine and Respondek, 2001a), the items  $(Ch1)-(Ch3)$  assure the existence of an invertible static feedback transformation  $u = \beta \tilde{u}$  and a change of coordinates  $z = \phi(x)$  bringing the distribution  $\mathcal{G}^0$  into the chained form, which transform the system  $\Sigma_{aff}$  into

$$\begin{cases} \dot{z}_0 = a_0(z) + \tilde{u}_0 \dot{z}_1 & = a_1(z) & + z_2 \tilde{u}_0 \\ & \vdots \\ \dot{z}_{k-1} & = a_{k-1}(z) + z_k \tilde{u}_0 \\ \dot{z}_k & = a_k(z) & + \tilde{u}_1 \end{cases}$$

with  $a_i$  smooth functions. Applying the invertible static feedback  $v_0 = a_0(z) + \tilde{u}_0$  and  $v_1 = a_k(z) + \tilde{u}_1$ , we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \dot{z}_0 = v_0 \dot{z}_1 & = f_1(z) & + z_2 v_0 \\ & \vdots \\ \dot{z}_{k-1} & = f_{k-1}(z) + z_k v_0 \\ \dot{z}_k & = v_1 \end{cases}$$

where  $f_i = a_i - z_{i+1}a_0$ . In these coordinates, we have

$$\mathcal{G}^i = \mathcal{G}_i = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-i}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_0} + z_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + \dots + z_{k-i} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-i-1}} \right\}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq k-1,$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}^i = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-i+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k} \right\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k-2.$$

From  $[f, \mathcal{C}^i] \subset \mathcal{G}^i$ , for any  $1 \leq i \leq k-2$ , it follows immediately that

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial z_j} = 0, \quad \text{for } i+2 \leq j \leq k \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq k-2,$$

which gives the triangular normal form  $TCh_1^k$ . □

## 6.2 Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof. Necessity.* Consider a control-affine system  $\Sigma : \dot{x} = f(x) + \sum_{i=0}^m u_i g_i(x)$  locally, around  $x^*$ , static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_m^k$  and bring it into the form  $TCh_m^k$ , around  $z^*$ . To simplify the notation, we continue to write  $f$  and  $g_i$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , for the drift and the controlled vector fields of  $TCh_m^k$  and we denote

$$\text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^i} \right\} = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1^i}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_m^i} \right\}.$$

The distribution  $\mathcal{G}^0 = \text{span} \{g_i, 0 \leq i \leq m\}$ , associated to  $TCh_m^k$ , is given by

$$\mathcal{G}^0 = \text{span} \left\{ g_0, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^k} \right\}.$$

By an induction argument, it is immediate that

$$\mathcal{G}^i = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^{k-i}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^k}, g_0 \right\}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq k-1.$$

It follows that  $\mathcal{G}^{k-1} = TX$ , the distribution  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  has constant rank  $(k-1)m+1$  and contains an involutive subdistribution of constant corank one given by

$$\mathcal{L} = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^2}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^k} \right\},$$

and  $\mathcal{G}^0(z^*)$  is not contained in  $\mathcal{L}(z^*)$ . This shows  $(m\text{-}Ch1)\text{-}(m\text{-}Ch3)$ . The characteristic distribution of  $\mathcal{G}^i$  is given by

$$\mathcal{C}^i = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^{k-i+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^k} \right\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k-2,$$

and we have, for any  $k-i+1 \leq l \leq k$  and  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,

$$\left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j^l}, f \right] = \frac{\partial f_1^{l-1}}{\partial z_j^l} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1^{l-1}} + \dots + \frac{\partial f_m^{l-1}}{\partial z_j^l} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_m^{l-1}} \mod \mathcal{C}^i$$

which is clearly in  $\mathcal{G}^i$ . Thus  $[f, \mathcal{C}^i] \subset \mathcal{G}^i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq k-2$ , which proves item  $(m\text{-}Comp)$ .

*Sufficiency.* Consider the control-affine system  $\Sigma_{aff} : \dot{x} = f(x) + \sum_{i=0}^m u_i g_i(x)$  satisfying the conditions  $(m\text{-}Ch1)\text{-}(m\text{-}Ch3)$  and  $(m\text{-}Comp)$ . According to Theorem 5.6 in (Pasillas-Lépine and Respondek, 2001a), the items  $(m\text{-}Ch1)\text{-}(m\text{-}Ch3)$  assure the existence of an invertible static feedback transformation  $u = \beta \tilde{u}$  and of a change of coordinates  $z = \phi(x)$  (see Appendix B where we explain how to construct the diffeomorphism  $\phi$  and the feedback transformation) bringing the distribution  $\mathcal{G}^0$  into the  $m$ -chained form and thus the system  $\Sigma_{aff}$  into

$$\begin{cases} \dot{z}_0 = a_0(z) + \tilde{u}_0 & \dot{z}_1^1 = a_1^1(z) + z_1^2 \tilde{u}_0 & \dots & \dot{z}_m^1 = a_m^1(z) + z_m^2 \tilde{u}_0 \\ & \dot{z}_1^2 = a_1^2(z) + z_1^3 \tilde{u}_0 & & \dot{z}_m^2 = a_m^2(z) + z_m^3 \tilde{u}_0 \\ & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \dot{z}_1^{k-1} = a_1^{k-1}(z) + z_1^k \tilde{u}_0 & \dots & \dot{z}_m^{k-1} = a_m^{k-1}(z) + z_m^k \tilde{u}_0 \\ \dot{z}_1^k = a_1^k(z) + \tilde{u}_1 & \dots & \dot{z}_m^k = a_m^k(z) + \tilde{u}_m \end{cases}$$

with  $a_j^i$  smooth functions. Applying the invertible static feedback  $v_0 = a_0(z) + \tilde{u}_0$  and  $v_i = a_i^k(z) + \tilde{u}_i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , we get

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{llll} \dot{z}_0 = v_0 \dot{z}_1^1 & = f_1^1(z) + z_1^2 v_0 & \cdots & \dot{z}_m^1 = f_m^1(z) + z_m^2 v_0 \\ & \dot{z}_1^2 = f_1^2(z) + z_1^3 v_0 & & \dot{z}_m^2 = f_m^2(z) + z_m^3 v_0 \\ & \vdots & & \vdots \\ & \dot{z}_1^{k-1} = f_1^{k-1}(z) + z_1^k v_0 & \cdots & \dot{z}_m^{k-1} = f_m^{k-1}(z) + z_m^k v_0 \\ & \dot{z}_1^k = v_1 & \cdots & \dot{z}_m^k = v_m \end{array} \right.$$

with  $f_j^i = a_j^i - z_j^{i+1} a_0$ . In the  $z$ -coordinates, we have

$$\mathcal{G}^i = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^{k-i}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^k}, g_0 \right\}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq k-1.$$

The characteristic distribution of  $\mathcal{G}^i$  is given by

$$\mathcal{C}^i = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^{k-i+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^k} \right\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k-2,$$

and the corank one involutive subdistribution of  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  by

$$\mathcal{L} = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^2}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^k} \right\}.$$

We have, for  $1 \leq i \leq k-2$ ,

$$\left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j^{k-i+1}}, f \right] = \sum_{l=1}^m \sum_{s=1}^{k-i-1} \frac{\partial f_l^s}{\partial z_j^{k-i+1}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_l^s} \text{ mod } \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^{k-i}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^{k-1}} \right\}$$

and since  $\left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j^{k-i+1}}, f \right] \in \mathcal{G}^i$ , for any  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , we obtain

$$\frac{f_l^s}{z_j^{k-i+1}} = 0, \quad \text{for any } 1 \leq j, l \leq m, \quad 1 \leq s \leq k-i-1.$$

It follows that  $f$  exhibits the desired triangular form  $TCh_m^k$ . □

### 6.3 Proof of Theorem 3

*Proof of (F1).* Consider the two-input control-affine system  $\Sigma : \dot{x} = f(x) + u_0 g_0(x) + u_1 g_1(x)$  locally, around  $x^*$ , feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$  and bring it into the form  $TCh_1^k$ , around  $z^*$ . To simplify notation, we continue to denote by  $f$ , respectively by  $g_0$  and  $g_1$ , the drift, respectively the controlled vector fields of  $TCh_1^k$ .

It is clear that  $TCh_1^k$  is  $x$ -flat, with  $\varphi = (z_0, z_1)$  being a flat output, at any point  $(z^*, v^*)$  satisfying

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial z_{i+1}}(z^*) + v_0^* \neq 0, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq k-1,$$

where  $v^* = (v_0^*, v_1^*)$ . Recall that, in coordinates  $z$ , we have

$$\mathcal{G}^i = \text{span}\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-i}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_0} + z_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + \dots + z_{k-i} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-i-1}}\right\}, \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq k-1,$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}^i = \text{span}\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-i+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}\right\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k-2.$$

Notice that for each  $0 \leq i \leq k-3$ , the only nontrivial condition for  $[f + u_0^i g_0 + u_1^i g_1, \mathcal{C}^{i+1}] \subset \mathcal{G}^i$  to be satisfied for  $TCh_1^k$  is  $[f + v_0^i g_0 + v_1^i g_1, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-i}}] \in \mathcal{G}^i$  implying  $[f, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-i}}] - v_0^i \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k-i-1}} \in \mathcal{G}^i$  and hence

$$\frac{\partial f_{k-i-1}}{\partial z_{k-i}}(z) + v_0^i = 0.$$

The latter is feedback invariant because  $[f + u_0^i g_0 + u_1^i g_1, \mathcal{C}^{i+1}] \subset \mathcal{G}^i$  is feedback invariant as explained just after the definition of  $U_{sing}^i$  in Section 4. Another argument proving feedback invariance is that we look for the vector field  $f(x) + u_0(x)^i g_0 + u_1(x)^i g_1$  belonging to the affine distribution  $f(x) + \mathcal{G}^0(x)$  which, obviously, is feedback invariant. To summarize,  $v^* \in \bigcup_{i=0}^{k-3} U_{sing}^i(z^*)$  if and only if

$$\frac{\partial f_{k-i-1}}{\partial z_{k-i}}(z^*) + v_0^* = 0, \quad 0 \leq i \leq k-3.$$

To analyze the condition  $[f + u_0^{k-2} g_0 + u_1^{k-2} g_1, l] \in \mathcal{G}^{k-2}$ , where  $l \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $l \notin \mathcal{C}^{k-2}$ , take  $l = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}$ . Then

$$[f + v_0^{k-2} g_0 + v_1^{k-2} g_1, l] = [f, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}] - v_0^{k-2} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} \in \mathcal{G}^{k-2},$$

if and only if

$$\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z_2}(z) + v_0^{k-2} = 0.$$

The definition of  $U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}$  is feedback invariant (for the same reasons as those giving invariance of  $U_{sing}^i$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq k-3$ ) and thus  $v^* \in U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}$  if and only if  $\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z_2}(z^*) + v_0^* = 0$ , where  $\mathcal{L}$  is such that  $\mathcal{G}^0(x^*) \notin \mathcal{L}(x^*)$ . If  $\mathcal{L}$  is such that  $\mathcal{G}^0(x^*) \in \mathcal{L}(x^*)$ , we will show when proving the equivalence (i)  $\iff$  (ii), that under the assumption, which we always assume,  $(d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_0 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_1)(x^*, u^*) \neq 0$ , where  $\mathcal{L}^\perp = \text{span}\{d\varphi_0, d\varphi_1\}$ , we have  $u^* \notin U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}(x^*)$  and in  $\mathcal{X}^* \times \mathbb{R}^2$ , where  $\mathcal{X}^*$  is a sufficiently small neighborhood of  $x^*$ , the set  $U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}(x)$  consists of two connected components that define, for each fixed value  $x \in \mathcal{X}^*$ ,  $x \neq x^*$ , an affine subspace of  $U = \mathbb{R}^2$ .

Now observe that the set of the singular control values  $U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}$  (at which  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  ceases to be a flat output for  $TCh_1^k$ ) is determined by  $\mathcal{L}$  which, in turn, is uniquely associated to the choice of the flat output  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  by  $\mathcal{L}^\perp = \text{span}\{d\varphi_0, d\varphi_1\}$ . Different choices of  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  lead, in general, to different distributions  $\mathcal{L}$  and, consequently, to different singular control values and the system is not flat only at those that are singular for all choices of  $\mathcal{L}$ . Hence

$$U_{sing} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k-3} U_{sing}^i \cup U_{sing}^{k-2}$$

where

$$U_{sing}^{k-2} = \bigcap_{\mathcal{L}} U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}.$$

*Proof of (F2).* It was shown in (Li and Respondek, 2012) that conditions (FO2) and (FO2)' are equivalent (for control-linear systems  $\Sigma_{lin}$  but notice that (FO2) and (FO2)' do not involve the drift  $f$ ). We deduce immediately that (ii)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii). We will now prove that (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i).

First consider the case  $(L_g\varphi_0, L_g\varphi_1)(x^*) \neq (0, 0)$ . By (Li and Respondek, 2012), a pair  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  satisfying (FO1) – (FO2) forms a flat output of the control-linear system  $\Sigma_{lin}$  and, also by (Li and Respondek, 2012),  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  is compatible with the chained form so there exists a local static feedback transformation bringing  $\Sigma_{lin}$  into the chained form with  $z_0 = \varphi_0$  and  $z_1 = \varphi_1 + k_0\varphi_0$ ,  $k_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ , which thus transforms the control-affine system  $\Sigma_{aff}$  into

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}_0 &= f_0(z) + v_0 & \dot{z}_1 &= f_1(z) + z_2 v_0 \\ & & \vdots & \\ \dot{z}_{k-1} &= f_{k-1}(z) + z_k v_0 \\ \dot{z}_k &= f_k(z) + v_1 \end{aligned}$$

Replacing  $v_0$  by  $v_0 - f_0$  and  $v_1$  by  $v_1 - f_k$  and using  $[f, \mathcal{C}^i] \subset \mathcal{D}^i$ , we conclude (repeating the proof of (F1)) that the system is in the triangular form and thus, flat at  $(x^*, u^*)$  such that  $u^* \notin U_{\mathcal{L}-sing} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k-3} U_{sing}^i \cup U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}$ , where  $\mathcal{L} = (\text{span}\{d\varphi_0, d\varphi_1\})^\perp$ .

Now consider the case  $(L_g\varphi_0, L_g\varphi_1)(x^*) = (0, 0)$ . Since  $\Sigma_{aff} : \dot{x} = f(x) + u_0 g_0(x) + u_1 g_1(x)$  is locally, around  $x^*$ , feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$ , we can assume that  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is in the triangular form  $TCh_1^k$  around  $z^* = 0$ :

$$TCh_1^k \left\{ \begin{aligned} \dot{z}_0 &= v_0 & \dot{z}_1 &= f_1(z_0, z_1, z_2) + z_2 v_0 \\ & & \dot{z}_2 &= f_2(z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3) + z_3 v_0 \\ & & \vdots & \\ & & \dot{z}_{k-1} &= f_{k-1}(z_0, \dots, z_k) + z_k v_0 \\ & & \dot{z}_k &= v_1 \end{aligned} \right.$$

The characteristic distribution  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2}$  takes the form  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2} = \text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z_3}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}\}$ , and the condition  $L_c \varphi_i = 0$ , for any  $c \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2}$ , given by (FO2) implies that  $\varphi_i = \varphi_i(z_0, z_1, z_2)$ , for  $i = 0, 1$ . Condition (FO1) implies that  $d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1(x^*) \neq 0$ , that is equivalent to

$$\text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \varphi_0}{\partial z_0} & \frac{\partial \varphi_0}{\partial z_1} & \frac{\partial \varphi_0}{\partial z_2} \\ \frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial z_0} & \frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial z_1} & \frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial z_2} \end{pmatrix} (0) = 2.$$

Notice that the condition  $(L_g\varphi_0, L_g\varphi_1)(x^*) = (0, 0)$  implies that  $\frac{\partial \varphi_0}{\partial z_0}(0) = \frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial z_0}(0) = 0$  and thus we get

$$\text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \varphi_0}{\partial z_1} & \frac{\partial \varphi_0}{\partial z_2} \\ \frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial z_1} & \frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial z_2} \end{pmatrix} (0) = 2.$$

We assume  $\varphi_0(0) = \varphi_1(0) = 0$  (if not, replace  $\varphi_0$  by  $\varphi_0 - \varphi_0(0)$  and  $\varphi_1$  by  $\varphi_1 - \varphi_1(0)$ ). We will introduce new coordinates  $(\tilde{z}_1, \tilde{z}_2) = (\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  in two steps. Assume that  $\frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial z_2}(0) \neq 0$  (if not, permute  $\varphi_0$  and  $\varphi_1$ ) and put  $\tilde{z}_2 = \varphi_1(z_0, z_1, z_2)$ . Then the two first components become

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\tilde{z}}_1 &= \tilde{f}_1(z_0, z_1, \tilde{z}_2) + a(z_0, z_1, \tilde{z}_2)v_0 \\ \dot{\tilde{z}}_2 &= \tilde{f}_2(z_0, z_1, \tilde{z}_2, z_3) + b(z_0, z_1, \tilde{z}_2, z_3)v_0,\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{f}_2 = L_f \varphi_1$ ,  $b = L_{g_0} \varphi_1$  and  $a = z_2 = \varphi_1^{-1}(z_0, z_1, \tilde{z}_2)$  is the inverse of  $\varphi_1$  with respect to  $z_2$ . Notice that  $b = L_{g_0} \varphi_1 = \frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial z_0} + \frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial z_1} z_2 + \frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial z_2} z_3$  is affine with respect to  $z_3$  and  $\frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial z_2}(0) \neq 0$  so  $\tilde{z}_i = L_{g_0}^{i-3} b$ , for  $3 \leq i \leq k$ , is a valid local change of coordinates in which the system, under the feedback  $\tilde{v}_1 = L_f L_{g_0}^{k-3} b + v_0 L_{g_0}^{k-2} b + v_1 L_{g_1} L_{g_0}^{k-3} b$ , takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\tilde{z}}_0 &= v_0 \dot{\tilde{z}}_1 = \tilde{f}_1(z_0, z_1, \tilde{z}_2) + a(z_0, z_1, \tilde{z}_2)v_0 \\ \dot{\tilde{z}}_2 &= \tilde{f}_2(z_0, z_1, \tilde{z}_2, z_3) + \tilde{z}_3 v_0 \\ &\vdots \\ \dot{\tilde{z}}_{k-1} &= \tilde{f}_{k-1}(z_0, z_1, \tilde{z}_2, \dots, \tilde{z}_k) + \tilde{z}_k v_0 \\ \dot{\tilde{z}}_k &= \tilde{v}_1.\end{aligned}$$

Now put  $\tilde{z}_1 = \varphi_0(z_0, z_1, z_2)$ . We get  $\dot{\tilde{z}}_1 = L_f \varphi_0 + v_0 L_{g_0} \varphi_0$ . Notice that  $L_{g_0} \varphi_0$  is affine with respect to  $z_3$  and  $L_f \varphi_0$  is, in general, nonlinear with respect to  $z_3$  since so is  $\tilde{f}_2$ . Omitting “ $\sim$ ” we get

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\tilde{z}}_0 &= v_0 \dot{\tilde{z}}_1 = f_1(z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3) + (A + Bz_3)v_0 \\ \dot{\tilde{z}}_2 &= f_2(z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3) + z_3 v_0 \\ &\vdots \\ \dot{\tilde{z}}_{k-1} &= f_{k-1}(z_0, z_1, \dots, z_k) + z_k v_0 \\ \dot{\tilde{z}}_k &= v_1,\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where  $A$  and  $B$  depend on  $z_0, z_1, z_2$  only. Observe that for (8), we have  $\varphi_0 = z_1$ ,  $\varphi_1 = z_2$  and  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2} = \text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z_3}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}\}$ , therefore the condition  $(L_g \varphi_0)L_{[c,g]} \varphi_1 = (L_g \varphi_1)L_{[c,g]} \varphi_0$  gives  $A + z_3 B = z_3 B$  and thus  $A \equiv 0$  everywhere.

Notice that the function  $f_2(z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3)$  can always be expressed as

$$f_2(z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3) = f_{20}(z_0, z_1, z_2) + z_3 f_{21}(z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3)$$

for some smooth functions  $f_{20}$  and  $f_{21}$  and thus

$$\dot{\tilde{z}}_2 = f_2(z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3) + z_3 v_0 = f_{20}(z_0, z_1, z_2) + z_3(f_{21}(z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3) + v_0).$$

Define the new control  $\tilde{v}_0 = f_{21}(z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3) + v_0$  and denote  $\eta = f_{21}$ , then (8) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\tilde{z}}_0 &= \tilde{v}_0 - \eta \dot{\tilde{z}}_1 = \tilde{f}_1(z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3) + z_3 B \tilde{v}_0 \\ \dot{\tilde{z}}_2 &= \tilde{f}_2(z_0, z_1, z_2) + z_3 \tilde{v}_0 \\ &\vdots \\ \dot{\tilde{z}}_{k-1} &= \tilde{f}_{k-1}(z_0, \dots, z_k) + z_k \tilde{v}_0 \\ \dot{\tilde{z}}_k &= v_1,\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where  $\tilde{f}_2 = f_{20}$  and  $\tilde{f}_i = f_i - z_3 B \eta$ , for  $i \neq 2$ .

Note that  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is assumed to be locally, around  $x^* \in X$ , static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$ , hence the conditions  $[f, \mathcal{C}^i] \subset \mathcal{G}^i$  hold, for  $1 \leq i \leq k-2$ , and are invariant under change of

coordinates and feedback. Clearly, for (9),  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2} = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_3}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k} \right\}$  and thus  $[\tilde{f}, \mathcal{C}^{k-2}] \subset \mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  implies  $[\tilde{f}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_3}] \in \mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  and yields

$$\left[ \tilde{f}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_3} \right] = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial z_3} \\ \frac{\partial \tilde{f}_1}{\partial z_3} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \alpha \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ z_3 B \\ z_3 \end{pmatrix} + \beta \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ B \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

modulo  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2}$ , for some smooth functions  $\alpha, \beta$  which gives  $\frac{\partial \tilde{f}_1}{\partial z_3} = 0$ . Therefore  $\tilde{f}_1 = \tilde{f}_1(z_0, z_1, z_2)$  and thus (9) is, actually, in the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}_0 &= \tilde{v}_0 - \eta & \dot{z}_1 &= \tilde{f}_1(z_0, z_1, z_2) & + z_3 B \tilde{v}_0 \\ & & \dot{z}_2 &= \tilde{f}_2(z_0, z_1, z_2) & + z_3 \tilde{v}_0 \\ & & & \vdots & \\ & & \dot{z}_{k-1} &= \tilde{f}_{k-1}(z_0, \dots, z_k) & + z_k \tilde{v}_0 \\ & & \dot{z}_k &= v_1, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

with  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1) = (z_1, z_2)$ . Define a new variable  $y = z_3 \tilde{v}_0$ . Notice that, although  $y = z_3 \tilde{v}_0$  is not a valid control transformation (since  $z_3^* = 0$ ), it is a system's variable under the assumption that the differentials  $dy = z_3 d\tilde{v}_0 + \tilde{v}_0 dz_3$  is nonzero at  $(z^*, \tilde{v}_0^*)$ . Actually,  $\dot{\varphi}_0$  and  $\dot{\varphi}_1$  are functions of the system variables  $z_0, z_1, z_2$  and  $y$ . Recall that  $\varphi_0 = z_1$  and  $\varphi_1 = z_2$ . The condition  $\text{rk} \frac{\partial(\varphi, \dot{\varphi})}{\partial(x, u)}(x^*, u^*) = 4$  together with

$$\frac{\partial(\varphi, \dot{\varphi})}{\partial(x, u)} = \frac{\partial(\varphi, \dot{\varphi})}{\partial(z_0, z_1, z_2, y)} \cdot \frac{\partial(z_0, z_1, z_2, y)}{\partial(x, u)}$$

implies that  $\text{rk} \frac{\partial(\dot{\varphi}_0, \dot{\varphi}_1)}{\partial(z_0, y)}(z^*, v^*) = 2$ . By the implicit function theorem, we can express

$$\begin{aligned} z_0 &= \zeta_0(\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dot{\varphi}_0, \dot{\varphi}_1) \\ y &= \zeta_y(\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dot{\varphi}_0, \dot{\varphi}_1) \end{aligned}$$

in a neighborhood of  $(z^*, v^*)$ , for some smooth functions  $\zeta_0, \zeta_y$ .

We have  $\dot{z}_0 = \tilde{v}_0 - \eta = v_0$  and  $\dot{z}_2 = \tilde{f}_2 + z_3 \tilde{v}_0 = \tilde{f}_2 + z_3(v_0 + \eta)$ . Recall that  $\tilde{f}_2$  depends on  $z_0, z_1, z_2$  only. So knowing  $\dot{z}_0 = v_0$  and  $\dot{z}_2$ , we can calculate  $z_3$  using the implicit functions theorem if  $v_0 + \eta + z_3 \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial z_3} \neq 0$ . Then  $\dot{z}_3$  gives  $z_4$  if  $v_0 + \eta + \frac{\partial f_4}{\partial z_4} \neq 0$  and so on, proving that indeed  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  is an  $x$ -flat output at  $(x^*, u^*)$ .

To conclude the proof, we have to show the implication (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii). When proving Proposition 3, we will show that any flat output  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  of a system  $\Sigma_{aff}$  feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$  satisfies  $(d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_0 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_1)(x^*, u^*) \neq 0$  and  $L_c \varphi_0 = L_c \varphi_1 = (L_g \varphi_0) L_{[c, g]} \varphi_1 - (L_g \varphi_1) L_{[c, g]} \varphi_0 = 0$ , for any  $c \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2}$ . If  $(L_g \varphi_0, L_g \varphi_1)(x^*) \neq (0, 0)$ , we conclude in the same way as for item (F1) that the singular control values  $v^*$  coincide with  $v^* \in U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}(z^*)$ .

Let us consider the case  $(L_g \varphi_0, L_g \varphi_1)(x^*) = (0, 0)$ . Since the conditions  $L_c \varphi_0 = L_c \varphi_1 = (L_g \varphi_0) L_{[c, g]} \varphi_1 - (L_g \varphi_1) L_{[c, g]} \varphi_0 = 0$  are valid everywhere on  $X$ , we repeat the proof of (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) and bring the system into the form (10), around  $z^* = 0$ , with  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1) = (z_1, z_2)$ . Now we will show that the singular control values  $v^*$  at which the procedures of calculating  $z_0$  and  $v_0$  fail, given by  $\text{rk} \frac{\partial(\dot{\varphi}_0, \dot{\varphi}_1)}{\partial(z_0, y)}(z^*, v^*) \leq 1$  and  $v_0^* = -(\eta + z_3 \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial z_3})(z^*)$ , coincide with  $v^* \in U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}(z^*)$  and  $v^* \in U_{sing}^{k-3}(z^*)$ , respectively.

To this end, calculate  $U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}^{k-2}(z) = \{v(z) = (v_0, v_1)^\top : [f + v_0 g_0 + v_1 g_1, l] \in \mathcal{G}^{k-2}\}$ . Since  $d\varphi_0 = dz_1$  and  $d\varphi_1 = dz_2$ , we have  $\mathcal{L} = (\text{span} \{d\varphi_0, d\varphi_1\})^\perp = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_0}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_3}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_4}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k} \right\}$  and  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2} =$

$\mathcal{L} + \text{span}\{B\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}\}$ . Thus  $[f + v_0g_0 + v_1g_1, l] \in \mathcal{G}^{k-2}$ , for any  $l \in \mathcal{L}$ , holds (taking the only nontrivial case  $l = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_0}$ ) if and only if  $[f, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_0}] + v_0[g_0, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_0}] \in \mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  which is equivalent to  $[(\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z_0} + v_0z_3\frac{\partial B}{\partial z_0})\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial z_0}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}] \in \mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  and thus to  $[(\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z_0} + v_0z_3\frac{\partial B}{\partial z_0})\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial z_0}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}] \wedge (B\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}) = 0$ . This yields  $v^* \in U_{\mathcal{L}-\text{sing}}^{k-2}(z^*)$  if and only if  $\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z_0}(z^*) - B\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial z_0}(z^*) + v_0^*z_3^*\frac{\partial B}{\partial z_0}(z^*) = 0$  which coincides with  $\text{rk}\frac{\partial(\dot{\varphi}_0, \dot{\varphi}_1)}{\partial(z_0, y)}(z^*, v^*) \leq 1$ .

Notice that under the assumption  $(d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_0 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_1)(z^*, u^*) \neq 0$ , we have  $\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z_0}(z^*) - B\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial z_0}(z^*) \neq 0$  and, since  $z^* = 0$ , it follows that  $v_0^* \notin U_{\mathcal{L}-\text{sing}}^{k-2}(z^*)$ . Moreover, since  $\frac{\partial B}{\partial z_0} \neq 0$  (otherwise  $\mathcal{G}^{k-1} \neq TX$ ), for each fixed value  $x \neq x^*$  in  $\mathcal{X}^*$ , a sufficiently small neighborhood of  $x^*$ , we get  $(v_0, v_1) \in U_{\mathcal{L}-\text{sing}}^{k-2}(z^*)$  with  $v_0 = \frac{\psi(z_0, z_1, z_2)}{z_3}$ , where  $\psi = (\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z_0})(\frac{\partial B}{\partial z_0})^{-1}$ , and  $v_1$  any. Thus in  $\mathcal{X}^* \times \mathbb{R}^2$ , the set  $U_{\mathcal{L}-\text{sing}}^{k-2}(x)$  consists of two connected components that define, for each fixed value  $x \in \mathcal{X}^*$ ,  $x \neq x^*$ , an affine subspace of  $U = \mathbb{R}^2$ .

To analyze  $v_0^* = -(\eta + z_3\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial z_3})(z^*)$ , notice that for (10),  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2} = \text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z_3}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_n}\}$  and  $\mathcal{G}^{n-3} = \mathcal{C}^{k-2} + \text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z_0} + z_3B\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + z_3\frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}\}$ . It follows that  $[\tilde{f} + \tilde{v}_0\tilde{g}_0 + \tilde{v}_1\tilde{g}_1, \mathcal{C}^{k-2}] \in \mathcal{G}^{n-3}$  is equivalent to  $[\tilde{f} + \tilde{v}_0g_0 + \tilde{v}_1g_1, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_3}] \wedge (\frac{\partial}{\partial z_0} + z_3B\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + z_3\frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}) = 0 \bmod \mathcal{C}^{k-2}$ , which yields  $-\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial z_3} + \tilde{v}_0(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + z_3\frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}) \wedge (\frac{\partial}{\partial z_0} + z_3(B\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2})) = 0$  implying  $z_3\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial z_3} + \tilde{v}_0 = z_3\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial z_3} + \eta + v_0 = 0$ . Thus, indeed,  $v_0^* = -(z_3\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial z_3} + \eta)(z^*)$  if and only if  $v^* \in U_{\text{sing}}^{n-3}(z^*)$ .  $\square$

#### 6.4 Proof of Proposition 1

*Proof.* In (Li and Respondek, 2012), the equivalence of the following conditions has been proven for any two-input system feedback equivalent to the chained form and for a pair of smooth functions  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$ :

- (i) The pair  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  is an  $x$ -flat output of  $\Sigma_{lin}$  at  $(x^*, u^*)$ , where  $u^*$  is such that  $u_0^*g_0(x^*) + u_1^*g_1(x^*) \notin \mathcal{C}^1(x^*)$ ;
- (ii) The pair  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  satisfies the following conditions:
  - (FO1<sub>lin</sub>)  $d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1(x^*) \neq 0$ ;
  - (FO2<sub>lin</sub>)  $L_c\varphi_0 = L_c\varphi_1 = L_c(\frac{L_g\varphi_1}{L_g\varphi_0}) = 0$ , for any  $c \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2}$ , where the functions  $\varphi_0, \varphi_1$  are ordered such that  $L_g\varphi_0(x^*) \neq 0$ , which is always possible due to item (FO3<sub>lin</sub>);
  - (FO3<sub>lin</sub>)  $(L_g\varphi_0(x^*), L_g\varphi_1(x^*)) \neq (0, 0)$ ;
- (iii) The pair  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  satisfies the following conditions:
  - (FO1<sub>lin</sub>)'  $d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1(x^*) \neq 0$ ;
  - (FO2<sub>lin</sub>)'  $\mathcal{L} = (\text{span}\{d\varphi_0, d\varphi_1\})^\perp \subset \mathcal{G}^{k-2}$ ;
  - (FO3<sub>lin</sub>)'  $\mathcal{G}^0(x^*) \not\subset \mathcal{L}(x^*)$ .

In the view of the above, item (F3) is obvious. So is (F6) because (FO1)' yields (FO1<sub>lin</sub>)', the condition  $(L_g\varphi_0(x^*), L_g\varphi_1(x^*)) \neq (0, 0)$  implies (FO3<sub>lin</sub>)', and (FO2)' and (FO2<sub>lin</sub>)' coincide.

To show (F5), notice that (FO2)' and (FO2<sub>lin</sub>)' coincide. To prove that  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  satisfies (FO1), we can bring, see (Li and Respondek, 2012), the control-linear system  $\Sigma_{lin}$  into the chained form compatible with the flat output  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  (which is assumed to be a flat output of  $\Sigma_{lin}$ ), that is,  $Ch_1^k$  with  $z_0 = \varphi_0$  and  $z_1 = \varphi_1$ . In the  $z$ -coordinates, the drift takes the triangular form for  $TCh_1^k$ . By a direct calculation, we can check that  $(d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_0 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_1)(z^*, v^*) \neq 0$ , where  $v^* \notin U_{\mathcal{L}-\text{sing}}(z^*)$  and  $\mathcal{L} = (\text{span}\{d\varphi_0, d\varphi_1\})^\perp$ . Hence  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  is an  $x$ -flat output of  $\Sigma_{aff}$  at  $(x^*, \tilde{u}^*)$  where  $\tilde{u}^* \notin U_{\mathcal{L}-\text{sing}}(x^*)$ .

It remains to prove (F4). If  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  is a flat output of  $\Sigma_{lin}$ , then the conditions (FO1<sub>lin</sub>) – (FO3<sub>lin</sub>) are satisfied and thus so are (FO1) – (FO2) because (FO2) and (FO2<sub>lin</sub>) coincide and  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  being a flat output of  $\Sigma_{lin}$  satisfies (FO1) with  $\dot{\varphi}_i = L_{F_{lin}}\varphi_i$ ,  $i = 0, 1$ .

To prove the converse, we have to show that condition (FO1)  $(d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_0 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_1)(x^*, u^*) \neq 0$ , where  $\dot{\varphi}_i$ , for  $i = 0, 1$  is understood as  $\dot{\varphi}_i = L_{F_{lin}}\varphi_i$  and  $F_{lin} = u_0g_0 + u_1g_1$ , implies that

$(L_g\varphi_0, L_g\varphi_1)(x^*) \neq (0, 0)$ .

Bring  $\Sigma_{lin}$  into the chained form  $Ch_1^k$  around  $z^* = 0$  and let  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  be a flat output. Since  $L_c\varphi_0 = L_c\varphi_1 = 0$ , for all  $c \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2} = \text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z_3}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}\}$ , it follows  $\varphi_i = \varphi_i(z_0, z_1, z_2)$ , for  $i = 0, 1$ . Assume  $(L_g\varphi_0, L_g\varphi_1)(0) = (0, 0)$ , otherwise the claim holds. Thus  $\frac{\partial\varphi_i}{\partial z_0}(0) = 0$ , for  $i = 0, 1$ , and since  $(d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1)(0) \neq 0$ , we deduce  $\text{rk} \frac{\partial(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)}{\partial(z_1, z_2)}(0) = 2$ . Assume that  $\frac{\partial\varphi_1}{\partial z_2}(0) \neq 0$  (if not, permute  $\varphi_0$  and  $\varphi_1$ ) and put  $\tilde{z}_2 = \varphi_1$ . Notice that  $b = L_{g_0}\varphi_1 = \frac{\partial\varphi_1}{\partial z_0} + \frac{\partial\varphi_1}{\partial z_1}z_2 + \frac{\partial\varphi_1}{\partial z_2}z_3$  is affine with respect to  $z_3$  and  $\frac{\partial\varphi_1}{\partial z_2}(0) \neq 0$  so  $\tilde{z}_i = L_{g_0}^{i-3}b$ , for  $3 \leq i \leq k$ , is a valid local change of coordinates in which the system, under the feedback  $\tilde{v}_1 = v_0 L_{g_0}^{k-2}b + v_1 L_{g_1} L_{g_0}^{k-3}b$ , takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}_0 &= v_0 \quad \dot{z}_1 &= a(z_0, z_1, \tilde{z}_2)v_0 \\ \dot{z}_2 & &= \tilde{z}_3 v_0 \\ & &\vdots \\ \dot{z}_{k-1} &= \tilde{z}_k v_0 \\ \dot{z}_k &= \tilde{v}_1. \end{aligned}$$

where  $a = z_2 = \varphi_1^{-1}(z_0, z_1, \tilde{z}_2)$ . The condition  $(L_g\varphi_0)L_{[c,g]}\varphi_1 = (L_g\varphi_1)L_{[c,g]}\varphi_0$  yields  $\frac{\partial\varphi_0}{\partial z_0} + a\frac{\partial\varphi_0}{\partial z_1} = 0$ . So omitting the tildes, we obtain  $\dot{\varphi}_0 = \frac{\partial\varphi_0}{\partial z_2}z_3v_0 = \frac{\partial\varphi_0}{\partial z_2}\dot{\varphi}_1$ . Therefore the differentials satisfy  $d\dot{\varphi}_0 = \dot{\varphi}_1 d\frac{\partial\varphi_0}{\partial z_2} \text{ mod span}\{d\dot{\varphi}_1\}$  and since  $\dot{\varphi}_1(0) = 0$ , we get  $(d\dot{\varphi}_0 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_1)(0) = 0$ , which contradicts the independence of flat outputs and their differentials. Thus  $(L_g\varphi_0, L_g\varphi_1)(0) \neq (0, 0)$ . Now it is obvious that  $L_c(\frac{L_g\varphi_1}{L_g\varphi_0}) = 0$  is equivalent to  $(L_g\varphi_0)L_{[c,g]}\varphi_1 = (L_g\varphi_1)L_{[c,g]}\varphi_0$ , where  $L_g\varphi_0(x^*) \neq 0$  (after permuting  $\varphi_0$  and  $\varphi_1$ , if necessary).  $\square$

## 6.5 Proof of Proposition 2

*Proof.* For the proof of Proposition 2 in the case  $L_g\varphi_0(x^*) \neq 0$ , we refer the reader to (Li and Respondek, 2012). Let us consider the case  $L_g\varphi_0(x^*) = 0$ . Bring the system  $\Sigma_{aff}$  into the form  $TCh_1^k$ , around  $z^* = 0$ . The characteristic distribution  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2}$  takes the form  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2} = \text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z_3}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}\}$ , and the condition  $L_c\varphi_0 = 0$ , for any  $c \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2}$ , implies that  $\varphi_0 = \varphi_0(z_0, z_1, z_2)$ . From  $\langle d\varphi_0, \mathcal{G}^{k-2} \rangle(0) \neq 0$ , we deduce  $\frac{\partial\varphi_0}{\partial z_2}(0) \neq 0$ . Introducing the new coordinate  $\tilde{z}_2 = \varphi_0$  and following exactly the proof of item (F2) of Theorem 3, we get (omitting the tildes for  $\tilde{z}$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}_0 &= \tilde{v}_0 - \eta(z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3) \quad \dot{z}_1 &= \tilde{f}_1(z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3) + a(z_0, z_1, z_2)\tilde{v}_0 \\ \dot{z}_2 & &= \tilde{f}_2(z_0, z_1, z_2) + z_3\tilde{v}_0 \\ & &\vdots \\ \dot{z}_{k-1} &= \tilde{f}_{k-1}(z_0, \dots, z_k) + z_k\tilde{v}_0 \\ \dot{z}_k &= v_1, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

with  $\varphi_0 = z_2$ . The condition  $[f, \mathcal{C}^{k-2}] \in \mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  implies  $\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial z_3} = -a\frac{\partial\eta}{\partial z_3}$ . In these coordinates we have  $v = (L_g\varphi_0)[c_{k-2}, g] - (L_{[c_{k-2}, g]}\varphi_0)g = z_3\frac{\partial}{\partial z_2} - (\frac{\partial}{\partial z_0} + a\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + z_3\frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}) \text{ mod } \mathcal{C}^{k-2}$ . The distribution  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{C}^{k-2} + \text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z_0} + a\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1}\}$  is, indeed, involutive and of corank two in  $TX$ . Thus there exists a smooth function  $\psi = \psi(z_0, z_1, z_2)$  such that  $\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial z_1}(0) \neq 0$  and  $\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial z_0} + a\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial z_1} = 0$  and we put  $\tilde{z}_1 = \psi$ . Then  $\dot{\tilde{z}}_1 = L_f\psi + \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial z_2}z_3\tilde{v}_0 = \tilde{f}_1(z_0, z_1, z_2, z_3) + z_3B(z_0, z_1, z_2)\tilde{v}_0$ . From  $[f, \mathcal{C}^{k-2}] \in \mathcal{G}^{k-2}$ , it follows

that  $\bar{f}_1 = \bar{f}_1(z_0, z_1, z_2)$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{z}_0 &= \tilde{v}_0 - \eta \dot{\tilde{z}}_1 &= \bar{f}_1(z_0, z_1, z_2) &+ z_3 B \tilde{v}_0 \\ \dot{z}_2 &= \tilde{f}_2(z_0, z_1, z_2) &+ z_3 \tilde{v}_0 \\ &\vdots \\ \dot{z}_{k-1} &= \tilde{f}_{k-1}(z_0, \dots, z_k) &+ z_k \tilde{v}_0 \\ \dot{z}_k &= v_1,\end{aligned}$$

with  $\psi = \tilde{z}_1$  and  $\varphi_0 = z_2$ . The pair  $(\varphi_0, \psi) = (z_2, z_1)$  is an  $x$ -flat output at  $(z^*, v^*)$ , with  $v^* \notin U_{\mathcal{L}-sing}(z^*)$ , if and only if  $(\frac{\partial \bar{f}_1}{\partial z_0} - B \frac{\partial \tilde{f}_2}{\partial z_0})(0) \neq 0$ , i.e.,  $(d\psi \wedge d\dot{\psi} \wedge d\varphi_0 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_0)(0) \neq 0$ .  $\square$

### 6.6 Proof of Proposition 3

*Proof.* Consider  $\Sigma_{aff}$  static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$  and let  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  be a flat output at  $(x^*, u^*)$ , such that  $(L_g \varphi_0, L_g \varphi_1)(x^*) \neq (0, 0)$ , where  $g$  is an arbitrary vector field in  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $g(x^*) \notin \mathcal{C}^{k-2}(x^*)$ . Form the decoupling matrix  $D = (D_{ij})$ , where  $D_{ij} = L_{g_j} \varphi_i$ ,  $0 \leq i, j \leq 1$ . The involutive closure  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}^0$  of  $\mathcal{G}^0$  is  $TX$ , so  $1 \leq \text{rk } D(x) \leq 2$ . If  $\text{rk } D(x) = 2$ , then via a suitable feedback transformation  $\dot{\varphi}_i = \tilde{v}$ ,  $i = 0, 1$ , which contradicts flatness. Thus  $\text{rk } D(x) = 1$  in a neighborhood of  $x^*$ , since  $(L_g \varphi_0, L_g \varphi_1)(x^*) \neq (0, 0)$ . We have  $d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1(x) \neq 0$  so put  $z_0 = \varphi_0$ ,  $z_1 = \varphi_1$  and, after applying feedback, the first two components of the transformed system  $\dot{z} = f + v_0 g_0 + v_1 g_1$  become  $\dot{z}_0 = v_0$ ,  $\dot{z}_1 = a_1(z) + b_1(z)v_0$ . The successive time-derivatives  $\varphi_1^{(l)}$  of  $\varphi_1 = z_1$  cannot depend on  $v_1$ , for  $0 \leq l \leq k-1$  (it would contradict flatness) and the  $k$ -th derivative depends explicitly on  $v_1$ , otherwise we would obtain a contradiction with the independence of flat outputs and their time-derivatives at  $(x^*, u^*)$ . Notice, however, that  $\varphi_1^{(l)}$  is a polynomial of degree  $l$ , with respect to  $v_0$ , with the leading coefficient being  $L_{g_0}^{l-1} b_1$ . Since  $\varphi_1^{(l)}$  does not depend on  $v_1$ , for  $1 \leq l \leq k-1$ , it follows that  $L_{g_1} L_{g_0}^{l-1} b_1 = 0$  for  $1 \leq l \leq k-2$ . We claim that the functions  $z_0, z_1, b_1, \dots, L_{g_0}^{k-2} b_1$  are independent at any point of an open and dense  $X' \subset X$ . If not, take  $x_0$  and its open neighborhood  $V \subset X \setminus X'$  and let  $s$  be the largest integer such that  $z_0, z_1, b_1, \dots, L_{g_0}^s b_1$  are independent in  $V$ . Assume  $s \leq k-3$ . Introduce new coordinates  $z_i = L_{g_0}^{i-2} b_1$  in  $V$ , for  $2 \leq i \leq s$ . We get:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{z}_0 &= v_0 \quad \dot{z}_1 = a_1(z) + z_2 v_0 \\ \dot{z}_2 &= a_2(z) + z_3 v_0 \\ &\vdots \\ \dot{z}_{s+1} &= a_{s+1}(z) + z_{s+2} v_0 \\ \dot{z}_{s+2} &= a_{s+2}(z) + b_{s+2}(z_0, \dots, z_{s+2}) v_0 \\ \bar{\dot{z}} &= \bar{f} + \bar{g}_0 v_0 + \bar{g}_1 v_1\end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{z} = (z_{s+3}, \dots, z_k)$ . Notice that the vector field  $[g_0, g_1]$  is of the form  $\sum_{i=s+3}^k \alpha_i \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}$ , with  $\alpha_i$  smooth functions. We deduce that  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}^0$ , the involutive closure of  $\mathcal{G}^0 = \text{span}\{g_0, g_1\}$ , satisfies  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}^0 \subset \text{span}\{g_0, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{s+3}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}\}$ . This yields  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}^0 \neq TX$ , which contradicts the fact that for  $\Sigma_{aff}$ , static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$ , we have  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}^0 = TX$ . Thus  $s = k-2$  and we put  $z_2 = b_1, \dots, z_k = L_{g_0}^{k-2} b_1$ , and replace  $v_1$  by  $L_f L_{g_0}^{k-2} b_1 + v_0(L_{g_0}^{k-1} b_1) + v_1(L_{g_1} L_{g_0}^{k-2} b_1)$ . We get

$$g_0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_0} + z_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2} + \dots + z_{k-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k} \quad \text{and} \quad g_1 = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}.$$

Using exactly the same arguments as in sufficiency part of the proof of Theorem 1 (the forms of  $\mathcal{G}^i$  and of  $\mathcal{C}^i$  and the condition  $[f, \mathcal{C}^i] \in \mathcal{G}^i$ ) we conclude that on  $X'$ , open and dense in  $X$ , the system

is locally in the triangular form

$$TCh_1^k : \begin{cases} \dot{z}_0 = v_0 & \dot{z}_1 = f_1(z_0, z_1, z_2) + z_2 v_0 \\ & \vdots \\ \dot{z}_{k-1} = f_{k-1}(z_0, \dots, z_k) + z_k v_0 \\ \dot{z}_k = v_1 \end{cases}$$

The flat output  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1) = (z_0, z_1)$  satisfies

$$L_c \varphi_0 = L_c \varphi_1 = (L_g \varphi_0) L_{[c,g]} \varphi_1 - (L_g \varphi_1) L_{[c,g]} \varphi_0 = 0,$$

where  $c \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2} = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_3}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k} \right\}$  and  $g$  is any vector field such that  $\mathcal{G}^0 = \text{span} \{g, c_1\}$  where  $c_1 = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}$  is the characteristic vector field of  $\mathcal{G}^1$ . In order to prove that we can bring the system into the triangular form  $TCh_1^k$ , around any  $x^* \in X$  (and not only on  $X'$ ), notice that the characteristic distribution  $\mathcal{C}^{k-2}$  is defined everywhere (not only on  $X'$ ) so, by continuity, the conditions  $L_c \varphi_0 = L_c \varphi_1 = (L_g \varphi_0) L_{[c,g]} \varphi_1 - (L_g \varphi_1) L_{[c,g]} \varphi_0 = 0$  hold everywhere on  $X$  implying that if we put the control system  $\Sigma_{aff}$ , around an arbitrary point  $x^* \in X$ , into the triangular form  $TCh_1^k$ , then for the flat output  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$ , we have  $\varphi_i = \varphi_i(z_0, z_1, z_2)$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq 1$ , on  $X'$  and thus on  $X$ .

Since we have assumed that  $(L_g \varphi_0, L_g \varphi_1)(x^*) \neq (0, 0)$ , we can apply the following change of coordinates (permute  $\varphi_0$  and  $\varphi_1$ , if necessary)  $z_0 = \varphi_0$ ,  $z_1 = \varphi_1$  and  $z_i = L_{g_0}^{i-2} \psi$ , for  $2 \leq i \leq k$ , where  $\psi = \frac{L_{g_0} \varphi_1}{L_{g_0} \varphi_0}$ , in which the control vector fields are in the chained form with  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1) = (z_0, z_1)$ . The system  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is assumed to be feedback equivalent to the triangular form  $TCh_1^k$ , hence satisfies the compatibility condition (*Comp*). Using the  $z$ -coordinates and applying the feedback  $f \mapsto f - (L_f \varphi_0) g_0 - (L_f^{k-1} \psi) g_1$ , we transform  $\Sigma_{aff}$  into the triangular form  $TCh_1^k$  with  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1) = (\tilde{z}_0, \tilde{z}_1)$  around any  $x^* \in X$ .

Notice that we have proved, in particular, that any flat output  $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$  of a system  $\Sigma_{aff}$  feedback equivalent to  $TCh_1^k$  satisfies  $(d\varphi_0 \wedge d\varphi_1 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_0 \wedge d\dot{\varphi}_1)(x^*, u^*) \neq 0$  and  $L_c \varphi_0 = L_c \varphi_1 = (L_g \varphi_0) L_{[c,g]} \varphi_1 - (L_g \varphi_1) L_{[c,g]} \varphi_0 = 0$ , for any  $c \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2}$ , that is, conditions (FO1) – (FO2) of Theorem 3.  $\square$

## 6.7 Proof of Theorem 4

*Proof of (m-F1).* Consider a control-affine system  $\Sigma : \dot{x} = f(x) + \sum_{i=0}^m u_i g_i(x)$  locally, around  $x^*$ , static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_m^k$ , and bring it into the form  $TCh_m^k$ , around  $z^*$ . For simplicity of notation, we continue to denote by  $f$ , respectively by  $g_i$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , the drift, respectively the controlled vector fields of  $TCh_m^k$ .

It is clear that  $TCh_m^k$  is  $x$ -flat, with  $\varphi = (z_0, z_1^1, \dots, z_m^1)$  being a flat output, at any point  $(z^*, v^*) \in X \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$  satisfying

$$\text{rk } F^l(z^*) = m, \text{ for } 1 \leq l \leq k-1,$$

where  $F^l$ , for  $1 \leq l \leq k-1$ , is the  $m \times m$  matrix given by

$$F_{ij}^l = \frac{\partial(f_j^l + z_j^{l+1} v_0^*)}{\partial z_i^{l+1}}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i, j \leq m.$$

Moreover, the differential weight of  $\varphi = (z_0, z_1^1, \dots, z_m^1)$  is  $(k+1)(m+1)$ , since expressing  $z$  and  $v$  involves  $\varphi_i^{(j)}$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $0 \leq j \leq k$ .

Recall that in coordinates  $z$ , using the notation  $\text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z^i}\} = \text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z^1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_m^i}\}$ , we have

$$\mathcal{G}^i = \text{span}\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z^{k-i}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^k}, g_0\right\}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq k-1,$$

$$\mathcal{C}^i = \text{span}\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z^{k-i+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^k}\right\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k-2,$$

and

$$\mathcal{L} = \text{span}\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z^2}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^k}\right\}.$$

We have  $\mathcal{C}^1 = \text{span}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1^k}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1^k}\}$ , and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}^0 + [f + gv, \mathcal{C}^1] &= \mathcal{G}^0 + \text{span}\left\{[f + gv, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j^k}], 1 \leq j \leq m\right\} \\ &= \mathcal{G}^0 + \text{span}\left\{\frac{\partial(f_1^{k-1} + z_1^k v_0)}{\partial z_j^k} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1^{k-1}} + \dots + \frac{\partial(f_m^{k-1} + z_m^k v_0)}{\partial z_j^k} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_m^{k-1}}, 1 \leq j \leq m\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $gv = \sum_{i=0}^m g_i v_i$ . By induction, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}^i + [f + gv, \mathcal{C}^{i+1}] &= \\ \mathcal{G}^i + \text{span}\left\{\frac{\partial(f_1^{k-i-1} + z_1^{k-i} v_0)}{\partial z_j^{k-i}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1^{k-i-1}} + \dots + \frac{\partial(f_m^{k-i-1} + z_m^{k-i} v_0)}{\partial z_j^{k-i}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_m^{k-i-1}}, 1 \leq j \leq m\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore for any  $0 \leq i \leq k-2$ , we have  $\text{rk } F^{i+1}(z^*, v^*) = m$  if and only if  $\text{rk}(\mathcal{G}^i + [f + gv, \mathcal{C}^{i+1}])(z^*, v^*) = (i+2)m+1$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq k-3$ , and  $\text{rk}(\mathcal{G}^{k-2} + [f + gv, \mathcal{L}](z^*, v^*) = km+1$ . It follows that the original system  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is  $x$ -flat at  $(x^*, u^*)$  such that  $u^* \notin U_{m-sing}(x^*)$ , of differential weight at most  $(k+1)(m+1)$ .

As we have noticed,  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m) = (z_0, z_1^1, \dots, z_m^1)$  is an  $x$ -flat output of  $TCh_m^k$  of differential weight  $(k+1)(m+1)$  since expressing  $z$  and  $v$  involves  $\varphi_i^{(j)}$ , for  $0 \leq j \leq k$ .

Now, we will show (which is interesting as an independent observation) that the differential weight of any  $x$ -flat output of  $\Sigma_{aff} : \dot{x} = f + \sum_{i=0}^m u_i g_i$ , with  $m+1$  controls and  $km+1$  states, is at least  $(k+1)(m+1)$ . Let  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m)$  be an  $x$ -flat output of  $\Sigma_{aff}$ . Define  $D = (D_{ij})$ , where  $D_{ij} = L_{g_i} \varphi_j$  and put  $r(x) = \text{rk } D(x)$ . Clearly,  $r(x)$  is constant on an open and dense subset  $X'$  of  $X$  (so denote it  $r(x) = r$ ) and choose  $x_0 \in X'$ . By a suitable (local) change of coordinates and static invertible feedback, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}^0 &= v^0 & \dot{z}^1 &= A^1(z) + B^1(z)v^0 \\ \dot{z}^2 & & \dot{z}^2 &= A^2(z) + B^2(z)v \end{aligned}$$

where  $\dim z^0 = r$ ,  $\dim z^1 = m - r + 1$ ,  $z_0^0 = \varphi_0, \dots, z_{r-1}^0 = \varphi_{r-1}$  and  $z_r^1 = \varphi_r, \dots, z_m^1 = \varphi_m$ .

Due to flatness we can express (with the help of the flat outputs  $\varphi_i$  and their time-derivatives)  $mk+1$  components of  $z$  and  $m+1$  components of  $v$ , i.e.,  $m(k+1)+2$  functions. Using  $\varphi_i = z_i^0$  and  $\dot{\varphi}_i = v_i^0$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq r-1$ , we express  $2r$  system variables. The remaining  $m(k+1)+2-2r$  system variables (that is, the components of  $z^1, z^2$  and the remaining components of  $v$ ) depend on derivatives of  $\varphi_i$ ,  $r \leq i \leq m$ . Denote by  $s_i$  the maximal order of the derivative  $\varphi_i^{(s_i)}$ ,  $r \leq i \leq m$ , that is involved. Put  $s = \max\{s_i : r \leq i \leq m\}$ . By taking the time-derivatives of  $\varphi_i$  up to order

$s_i \leq s$ , we can express at most  $(s+1)(m-r+1)$  functions. This number cannot thus be smaller than the number of functions that remain to be expressed, that is, we need

$$(s+1)(m-r+1) \geq m(k+1) + 2 - 2r,$$

which is equivalent to

$$m(s-k) \geq (r-1)(s-1).$$

Now, three cases are possible. It is clear that if  $s < k$ , then the left hand side is negative, so the inequality is not satisfied. If  $s = k$ , then either  $r = 1$  or  $s = 1$ . The latter is impossible since  $s \geq 2$ . In the case  $r = 1$ , we have  $\dim z^0 = \dim v^0 = 1$  and in order to express all  $m(k+1) + 2$  variables of the system, we will use  $s = k$  derivatives  $v^0, \dot{v}^0, \ddot{v}^0, \dots, (v^0)^{(s-1)}$ . Thus the differential weight of  $\varphi$  is at least  $m(k+1) + s + 1 = m(k+1) + k + 1 = (m+1)(k+1)$ .

Finally, if  $s > k$ , then there exists  $\varphi_j$ , for some  $r+1 \leq j \leq m+1$ , that we differentiate  $s$  times so it involves at least  $s-1$  time derivatives of  $\dot{\varphi}_j = A_j^1(z) + B_j^1(z)v^0$ , where  $A_j^1$  is the  $j$ -th component of  $A^1$  and  $B_j^1$  is the  $j$ -th row of  $B^1$ . The involutive closure  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}^0$  of the distribution  $\mathcal{G}^0$  is  $TX$  so  $B_j^1$  is nonzero. It implies that  $\varphi_j^{(s)}$  depends nontrivially on (at least one) component of  $(v^0)^{(s-1)}$ . To summarize, we use  $mk+1$  functions to express  $z$ ,  $m+1$  functions to express  $v$ , and we also use the  $s-1$  derivatives  $\dot{v}^0, \ddot{v}^0, \dots, (v^0)^{(s-1)}$ , which gives at least  $(k+1)(m+1) + 1$  functions (since  $s > k$ ). Therefore the differential weight is higher than  $(k+1)(m+1)$  on  $X'$  and thus on  $X$ .

It remains to prove that the differential weight of any flat output (not necessary an  $x$ -flat output) cannot be smaller than  $(k+1)(m+1)$ . Let  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m)$  be an  $(x, u, \dot{u}, \dots, u^{(p)})$ -flat output of  $\Sigma_{aff}$ . Denote by  $s_i$  the highest derivative of  $\varphi_i$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , involved in expressing the state  $x$  and the control  $u$ , that is, by flatness,  $\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{U} \subset \Phi$ , where  $\mathcal{X} = \text{span}\{dx_1, \dots, dx_n\}$ ,  $\mathcal{U} = \text{span}\{du_0, \dots, du_m\}$  and  $\Phi = \text{span}\{d\varphi_i^{(j_i)}, 0 \leq i \leq m, 0 \leq j_i \leq s_i\}$ . Let  $s_{i^*}$  be the largest among the integers  $s_i$ . Either  $\varphi_{i^*}$  depends on  $u^{(l)}$ , with  $l \geq 1$  (but not on derivatives of  $u$  higher than  $l$ ) or  $\varphi_{i^*}$  depends on  $u$  (but not on derivatives of  $u$ ) or  $\varphi_{i^*}$  depends on  $x$  only. Then the differentials  $\varphi_{i^*}^{(j)}$  are independent modulo  $\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{U}$ , for  $0 \leq j \leq s_{i^*}$  (in the first case), for  $1 \leq j \leq s_{i^*}$  (in the second case) and for  $2 \leq j \leq s_{i^*}$  (in the third case, since  $\dot{\varphi}_{i^*}$  depends on  $u$  because  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}^0 = TX$ ). It follows that  $\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{U} \subset \Psi = \text{span}\{d\varphi_{i^*}, d\dot{\varphi}_{i^*}, d\varphi_{i^*}^{(j_i)}, 0 \leq i \leq m, i \neq i^*, 0 \leq j_i \leq s_i\}$ .

We claim that  $s_{i^*} \geq k$ . If not, then  $s_i \leq s_{i^*} \leq k-1$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq m$  (recall that  $s_{i^*} = \max\{s_i : 0 \leq i \leq m\}$ ), which implies  $\text{rk } \Psi \leq mk + 2 < m(k+1) + 2 = \text{rk } (\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{U})$ , contradicting  $\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{U} \subset \Psi$ . Thus  $s_{i^*} \geq k$ .

We have  $\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{U} \subset \Phi$  (by flatness) and  $d\ddot{\varphi}_{i^*}, \dots, d\varphi_{i^*}^{(s_{i^*})}$  belong to  $\Phi$  and are independent modulo  $\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{U}$ , so  $\text{rk } \Phi \geq \text{rk } (\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{U}) + k - 1 = m(k+1) + 2 + k - 1 = (m+1)(k+1)$  proving that the differential weight of  $\varphi$  is at least  $(m+1)(k+1)$ . Notice that  $\text{rk } \Phi = (m+1)(k+1)$  if and only if  $s_{i^*} = s_i = k$ , for any  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , implying that with  $\varphi_i$ ,  $i \neq i^*$ , we express  $mk$  system variables and the remaining two variables are expressed with  $\varphi_{i^*}$ . We deduce immediately that, in this case, all  $\varphi_i$  depend on  $x$  only.

*Proof of (m-F2).* Let  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m)$  be a minimal  $x$ -flat output for  $\Sigma_{aff}$ . When proving (m-F1) we have shown that we can bring the system into the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}_0 &= v_0 \quad \dot{z}^1 = A^1(z) + B^1(z)v^0 \\ \dot{z}^2 &= A^2(z) + B^2(z)v \end{aligned}$$

where  $z_0 = \varphi_0$  and  $z_1^1 = \varphi_1, \dots, z_m^1 = \varphi_m$  and  $\dim z_0 = \dim v_0 = 1$ , being a consequence of the minimal differential weight  $(k+1)(m+1)$  of  $\varphi$ . For  $i \leq i \leq m$ , denote by  $k_i$  the minimal integer such that  $\varphi_i^{(k_i)}$  depends explicitly on at least one  $v_j$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq m$ . Since  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is static feedback equivalent to  $TCh_m^k$ , it follows that  $k_i \leq k$ . In order to prove that  $k_i = k$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , suppose

that there exists  $k_i < k$  and assume, for simplicity, that  $k_1 < k$ . Denote  $\varphi_1^{(k_1)} = v_1$  (with  $v_1$  depending on  $v_0, \dots, v_0^{(k_1-1)}$ ).

Like in the the proof of (m-F1), notice that due to flatness we can express (with the help of the flat outputs  $\varphi_i$  and their time-derivatives)  $mk + 1$  components of  $z$  and  $m + 1$  components of  $v$ , i.e.,  $m(k + 1) + 2$  functions. Using  $\varphi_0 = z_0$  and  $\varphi_1 = z_1^1$ , we can express  $2 + k_1 + 1 = k_1 + 3$  variables of the system. The remaining  $m(k + 1) + 2 - (k_1 + 3)$  system variables depend on derivatives of  $\varphi_i$ ,  $2 \leq i \leq m$ . Denote by  $s_i$  the maximal order of the derivative  $\varphi_i^{(s_i)}$ ,  $2 \leq i \leq m$ , that is involved. Put  $s = \max\{s_i : 2 \leq i \leq m\}$ . By taking the time-derivatives of  $\varphi_i$  up to order  $s_i \leq s$ , we can express at most  $(s + 1)(m - 1)$  functions. This number cannot thus be smaller than the number of functions that remain to be expressed, that is, we need

$$(s + 1)(m - 1) \geq m(k + 1) + 2 - (k_1 + 3),$$

which is equivalent to

$$m(s - k) \geq s - k_1.$$

We have  $k_1 < k$  so the inequality can be satisfied only if  $s > k$ , but this give the differential weight of  $\varphi$  at least  $m(k + 1) + 2 + s - 1 \geq (k + 1)(m + 1) + 2$ , implying that  $\varphi$  is not a minimal flat output. It follows that for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$  we must have  $k_i = k$  (and the inequality is satisfied only in this case). The distribution  $\mathcal{L} = (\text{span}\{d\varphi_0, \dots, d\varphi_m\})^\perp$  is involutive (as annihilator of exact 1-forms) and satisfies  $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  (because all  $k_i = k$ ), as well as  $\mathcal{G}^0(x^*) \not\subset \mathcal{L}(x^*)$  (since  $g_0(x^*) \notin \mathcal{L}(x^*)$ ). It follows that  $\mathcal{G}^0$  is in the  $m$ -chained form in  $z$ -coordinates, where  $z_0 = \varphi_0$ ,  $z_i^j = L_{g_0}^{j-1}\varphi_i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq k$  (see Appendix B). The compatibility condition (m-Comp) implies that  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is in the triangular form.

*Proof of (m-F3).* We will prove the implications: (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i).

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii). Assume that the system  $\Sigma_{aff} : \dot{x} = f(x) + \sum_{i=0}^m u_i g_i(x)$  is  $x$ -flat at  $(x^*, u^*)$ , where  $u^* \notin U_{m-sing}(x^*)$ , and let  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m)$  be its minimal  $x$ -flat output defined in a neighborhood  $\mathcal{X}^*$  of  $x^*$ . It is well known that the differentials of flat outputs are independent at  $x^*$ , thus implying (m-FO1). By item (m-F2), that we have just proven, we can bring  $\Sigma_{aff}$ , around any point  $x \in \mathcal{X}^*$  into the triangular form compatible with the chained form  $TCh_m^k$ , with  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m) = (z_0, z_1^1, \dots, z_m^1)$  and  $x^*$  transformed into  $z^* \in \mathbb{R}^{km+1}$ . In coordinates  $z$ , the corank one involutive subdistribution  $\mathcal{L}$  of  $\mathcal{G}^{k-2}$  is given by

$$\mathcal{L} = \text{span}\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z^2}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z^k}\right\},$$

because it is unique and we immediately have

$$\mathcal{L}^\perp = \text{span}\{d\varphi_0, \dots, d\varphi_m\},$$

which gives (m-FO2) on  $\mathcal{X}^*$ .

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii). Suppose that the  $(m + 1)$ -tuple  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m)$  fulfills conditions (m-FO1)-(m-FO2). We apply the change of coordinates and the invertible feedback transformation presented in Appendix B (with  $\phi_i$  replaced by  $\varphi_i$  and  $\tilde{u}$  by  $v$ ) that bring the control-linear system  $\Sigma_{lin} : \dot{x} = \sum_{i=0}^m u_i g_i(x)$  into the  $m$ -chained form, with  $z_0 = \varphi_0$  and  $z_i^1 = \varphi_i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . Thus  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m) = (z_0, z_1^1, \dots, z_m^1)$  is a minimal  $x$ -flat output of  $Ch_m^k$  at any  $(z^*, v^*)$ , with  $v^* \neq 0$ . It follows that  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m)$  is a minimal  $x$ -flat output of  $\Sigma_{lin}$  at any  $(x^*, \tilde{u}^*)$ , with  $\tilde{u}^*$  such that  $\sum_{i=0}^m \tilde{u}_i^* g_i(x^*) \notin \mathcal{C}^1(x^*)$ .

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i). Assume that the system  $\Sigma_{lin} : \dot{x} = \sum_{i=0}^m u_i g_i(x)$  is  $x$ -flat at  $(x^*, \tilde{u}^*)$ , where  $\tilde{u}^*$  is such that  $\sum_{i=0}^m \tilde{u}_i^* g_i(x^*) \notin \mathcal{C}^1(x^*)$ , where  $\mathcal{C}^1$  is the characteristic distribution of  $\mathcal{G}^1$ . Let  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m)$  be its minimal  $x$ -flat output defined in a neighborhood  $\mathcal{X}$  of  $x^*$ . It is known, see (Li and Respondek, 2011), that the minimal flat output satisfies  $\mathcal{L}^\perp = \text{span}\{d\varphi_0, \dots, d\varphi_m\}$ . By the construction given in Appendix B, bring the system into the  $m$ -chained form  $Ch_m^k$  such that  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m) = (z_0, z_1^1, \dots, z_m^1)$  and  $z_i^j = L_{g_0}^{j-2} \psi_i$ , for  $2 \leq j \leq k$  and  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , where  $\psi_i = \frac{L_{g_0} \varphi_i}{L_{g_0} \varphi_0}$ . The system  $\Sigma_{aff}$  is assumed to be feedback equivalent to the triangular form  $TCh_m^k$ , hence satisfies the compatibility condition ( $m$ -Comp). Using the  $z$ -coordinates and applying the feedback  $f \mapsto f - \sum_{i=0}^m \alpha_i g_i$ , where  $\alpha_0 = L_f \varphi_0$  and  $\alpha_i = L_f^{k-1} \psi_i$ , we transform  $\Sigma_{aff}$  into the triangular form  $TCh_m^k$ . We have proved, when showing ( $m$ -F1), that  $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m) = (z_0, z_1^1, \dots, z_m^1)$  is an  $x$ -flat output of  $\Sigma_{aff}$  at  $(x^*, u^*)$  such that  $u^* \notin U_{m-sing}(x^*)$ .  $\square$

## Appendices

### A. Involutive subdistribution of corank one

Consider a non involutive distribution  $\mathcal{G}$  of rank  $d$ , defined on a manifold  $X$  of dimension  $n$  and define its annihilator  $\mathcal{G}^\perp = \{\omega \in \Lambda^1(X) : \langle \omega, f \rangle = 0, \forall f \in \mathcal{G}\}$ . Let  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_s$ , where  $s = n - d$ , be differential 1-forms locally spanning the annihilator of  $\mathcal{G}$ , that is  $\mathcal{G}^\perp = \mathcal{I} = \text{span}\{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_s\}$ . The *Engel rank* of  $\mathcal{G}$  equals 1 at  $x$  if and only if  $(d\omega_i \wedge d\omega_j)(x) = 0 \text{ mod } \mathcal{I}$ , for any  $1 \leq i, j \leq s$ . For any  $\omega \in \mathcal{I}$ , we define  $\mathcal{W}(\omega) = \{f \in \mathcal{G} : f \lrcorner d\omega \in \mathcal{G}^\perp\}$ , where  $\lrcorner$  is the interior product. The characteristic distribution  $\mathcal{C} = \{f \in \mathcal{G} : [f, \mathcal{G}] \subset \mathcal{G}\}$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  is given by

$$\mathcal{C} = \bigcap_{i=1}^s \mathcal{W}(\omega_i).$$

It follows directly from the Jacobi identity that the characteristic distribution is always involutive. Let  $\text{rk}[\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}] = d + r$ . Choose the differential forms  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_r, \dots, \omega_s$  such that  $\mathcal{I} = \text{span}\{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_s\}$  and  $\mathcal{I}^1 = \text{span}\{\omega_{r+1}, \dots, \omega_s\}$ , where  $\mathcal{I}^1$  is the annihilator of  $[\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}]$ . Define the distribution

$$\mathcal{B} = \sum_{i=1}^r \mathcal{W}(\omega_i).$$

We have the following result proved by (Bryant, 1979), see also (Pasillas-Lépine and Respondek, 2001a).

**Proposition 6:** *Consider a distribution  $\mathcal{G}$  of rank  $d$  and let  $\text{rk}[\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}] = d + r$ .*

- (i) *Assume  $r \geq 3$ . The distribution  $\mathcal{G}$  contains an involutive subdistribution of corank one if and only if it satisfies*
  - (ISD1) *The Engel rank of  $\mathcal{G}$  equals one;*
  - (ISD2) *The characteristic distribution  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  has rank  $d - r - 1$ .**Moreover, that involutive subdistribution is unique and is given by  $\mathcal{B}$ .*
- (ii) *Assume  $r = 2$ . The distribution  $\mathcal{G}$  contains a corank one subdistribution  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfying  $[\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}] \subset \mathcal{G}$  if and only if it verifies (ISD1)-(ISD2). In that case,  $\mathcal{B}$  is the unique distribution with the desired properties.*
- (iii) *Assume  $r = 1$ . The distribution  $\mathcal{G}$  contains an involutive subdistribution of corank one if and only if it satisfies the condition (ISD2). In the case  $r = 1$ , if an involutive subdistribution of corank one exists, it is never unique.*

## B. Constructing coordinates for the $m$ -chained form

In (Respondek and Pasillas-Lépine, 2001), the following characterization of the  $m$ -chained form was stated and proved: An  $(m + 1)$ -input driftless control system  $\Sigma_{lin} : \dot{x} = \sum_{i=0}^m u_i g_i(x)$ , with  $m \geq 2$ , defined on a manifold  $X$  of dimension  $km + 1$ , is locally static feedback equivalent, in a small neighborhood of a point  $x^* \in X$ , to the  $m$ -chained form if and only if its associated distribution  $\mathcal{G} = \text{span}\{g_0, \dots, g_m\}$  satisfies conditions  $(m\text{-}Ch1)$ – $(m\text{-}Ch3)$  of Theorem 2.

The prove of this result provides a method to compute the diffeomorphism bringing any control system, for which it is possible, to the  $m$ -chained form. Now, we will explain how to do it.

The involutive subdistribution  $\mathcal{L}$  is unique and can be explicitly calculated (see Appendix A). Choose  $m + 1$  independent functions  $\phi_0, \phi_1^1, \dots, \phi_m^1$  whose differentials annihilates  $\mathcal{L}$ , that is

$$\text{span}\{d\phi_0, d\phi_1^1, \dots, d\phi_m^1\} = (\mathcal{L})^\perp,$$

and a vector field  $g \in \mathcal{G}^0$  (which always exists due to condition  $(m\text{-}Ch3)$ ) such that  $g(x^*) \notin \mathcal{L}^{k-2}(x^*)$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume  $g = g_0$  and  $L_{g_0}\phi_0^0(x^*) \neq 0$  (otherwise permute the vector fields  $g_i$  or the functions  $\phi_i^1$ ). Define the coordinates

$$\begin{cases} z_0 = \phi_0 \\ z_i^1 = \phi_i^1, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, \\ z_i^j = \phi_i^j = \frac{L_{g_0}\phi_i^{j-1}}{L_{g_0}\phi_0}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad 2 \leq j \leq k, \end{cases}$$

and the feedback

$$\tilde{u}_0 = u_0 L_{g_0}\phi_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{u}_j = \sum_{i=0}^m u_i L_{g_i}\phi_j^k, \quad 1 \leq j \leq m.$$

In the above coordinates, the distribution  $\mathcal{G}$  takes the form

$$\mathcal{G} = \text{span}\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1^k}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_m^k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_0} + \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} z_j^{i+1} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j^i}\right\}$$

and, equivalently,  $\Sigma_{lin}$  takes the  $m$ -chained form.

## References

- Bryant, R. (1979). *Some aspects of the local and global theory of Pfaffian systems*. PhD thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Bryant, R., Chern, S., Gardner, R., Goldschmidt, H., and Griffiths, P. (1991). Exterior Differential Systems. *Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Publications*.
- Cartan, M. (1914). Sur l'équivalence absolue de certains systèmes d'équations différentielles et sur certaines familles de courbes. *Bulletin de la Société mathématique de France*, 2(42):12–48.
- Fliess, M., Levine, J., Martin, P., and Rouchon, P. (1992). Sur les systèmes non linéaires différentiellement plats. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 315(5):619–624.
- Fliess, M., Lévine, J., Martin, P., and Rouchon, P. (1995). Flatness and defect of non-linear systems: introductory theory and examples. *Internat. J. Control*, 61(6):1327–1361.
- Fliess, M., Lévine, J., Martin, P., and Rouchon, P. (1999). A Lie-Bäcklund approach equivalence and flatness of nonlinear systems. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 44(5):922–937.
- Giaro, A., Kumpera, A., and Ruiz, C. (1978). Sur la lecture correcte dun résultat d'Elie Cartan. *CR Acad. Sci. Paris*, 287:241–244.

- Isidori, A., Moog, C., and De Luca, A. (1986). A sufficient condition for full linearization via dynamic state feedback. In *Proc. IEEE CDC*, volume 25, pages 203–208. IEEE.
- Jakubczyk, B. (1993). Invariants of dynamic feedback and free systems. In *Proc. ECC*, pages 1510–1513.
- Kai, T. (2006). Extended chained forms and their application to nonholonomic kinematic systems with affine constraints: control of a coin on a rotating table. In *Proc. IEEE CDC*, pages 6104–6109. IEEE.
- Kumpera, A. and Ruiz, C. (1982). Sur l'équivalence locale des systèmes de Pfaff en drapeau. *Monge–Ampère Equations and Related Topics*, Editor F. Gherardelli, Ist. Naz. Alta Math. F. Severi, Rome, pages 201–247.
- Lévine, J. (2009). *Analysis and Control of Nonlinear Systems: A Flatness-Based Approach*. Springer.
- Li, S. and Respondek, W. (2011). The geometry, controllability, and flatness property of the  $n$ -bar system. *International Journal of Control*, 84(5):834–850.
- Li, S. and Respondek, W. (2012). Flat outputs of two-input driftless control systems. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 18:774–798.
- Li, S., Xu, C., and Chu, J. (2013). Characterization and flatness of the extended chained system. In *Proc. 32th Chinese Control Conference, Xian, China*, pages 1047–1051.
- Martin, P. (1992). *Contribution à l'étude des systèmes différentiellement plats*. PhD thesis, l'Ecole Nationale Supérieure de Mines de Paris.
- Martin, P. and Rouchon, P. (1993). Feedback linearization and driftless systems. *CAS internal report*, (446).
- Martin, P. and Rouchon, P. (1994). Feedback linearization and driftless systems. *Mathematics of Control, Signals and Systems*, 7(3):235–254.
- Martin, P., Rouchon, P., and Murray, R. (2003). Flat systems, equivalence and trajectory generation, CDS Technical Report, Caltech.
- Montgomery, R. and Zhitomirskii, M. (2001). Geometric approach to Goursat flags. In *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré (C) Non Linear Analysis*, volume 18, pages 459–493. Elsevier.
- Mormul, P. (2000). Goursat flags: classification of codimension-one singularities. *Journal of dynamical and control systems*, 6(3):311–330.
- Mormul, P. (2004). Multi-dimensional Cartan prolongation and special  $k$ -flags. In *Geometric Singularity Theory*, volume 65, pages 157–178. eds. H. Hironaka, S. Janeczko and S. Lojasiewicz, Warsaw: Banach Center Publications.
- Murray, R. (1994). Nilpotent bases for a class of nonintegrable distributions with applications to trajectory generation for nonholonomic systems. *Mathematics of Control, Signals and Systems*, 7(1):58–75.
- Olver, P. (1995). *Equivalence, Invariants and Symmetry*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pasillas-Lépine, W. and Respondek, W. (2000). On geometry of control systems equivalent to canonical contact systems: regular points, singular points, and flatness. In *Proc. IEEE CDC*, volume 5, pages 5151–5156.
- Pasillas-Lépine, W. and Respondek, W. (2001a). Contact systems and corank one involutive subdistributions. *Acta Applicandae Mathematica*, 69(2):105–128.
- Pasillas-Lépine, W. and Respondek, W. (2001b). On the geometry of Goursat structures. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 6:119–181.
- Pereira da Silva, P. (2001). Flatness of nonlinear control systems and exterior differential systems. volume LNCIS 295, pages 205–227. eds. A. Isidori, F. Lamnabhi-Lagarigue, and W. Respondek, London, Springer.
- Pomet, J. (1995). A differential geometric setting for dynamic equivalence and dynamic linearization. *Banach Center Publ., Vol. 32*, pages 319–339.
- Pomet, J. (1997). On dynamic feedback linearization of four-dimensional affine control systems with two inputs. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 2:151–230.
- Respondek, W. (2001). Transforming nonholonomic control systems into the canonical contact

- form. In *Proc. IEE CDC*, volume 2, pages 1781–1786. IEEE.
- Respondek, W. (2003). Symmetries and minimal flat outputs of nonlinear control systems. In *New Trends in Nonlinear Dynamics and Control and their Applications*, volume LNCIS 295, pages 65–86. Springer.
- Respondek, W. and Pasillas-Lépine, W. (2001). Canonical contact systems for curves: A survey. In *Contemporary Trends in Geometric Control Theory and Applications*, pages 77–112. eds. A. Anzaldo, B. Bonnard, J.P. Gauthier and F. Monroy, World Scientific, Singapore.
- Schlacher, K. and Schoeberl, M. (2007). Construction of flat outputs by reduction and elimination. In *Proc. Nolcos 2007*, 8(1):666–671.
- Shibuya, K. and Yamaguchi, K. (2009). Drapeau theorem for differential systems. *Differential Geometry and its Applications*, 27(6):793–808.
- Silveira, H. (2010). *Formas triangulares para sistemas no-lineares com duas entradas e controle de sistemas sem arrasto em  $SU(n)$  com aplicaes em mecânica quntica*. PhD thesis, Escola Politecnica da Universidade de São Paulo.
- Silveira, H., Pereira da Silva, P., and Rouchon, P. (2013). A flat triangular form for nonlinear systemes with two inputs: necessary and sufficient conditions. *arXiv:1312.3527 [math.OC]*.
- Vinogradov, A., Krasilchchik, I., and Lychagin, V. (1986). *Geometry of Jet Spaces and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*. Gordon and Breach, New York.
- Yamaguchi, K. (1982). Contact geometry of higher order. *Japanese Journal of Mathematics*, 8(1):109–176.